[[1904 Geneva Publishing House]]

Rue de la Coulouvreniere, 27

Riazanov

Goldendach

Riazanov - 19-oye fevralya (February 19th)

February 19th - The Peasent Emancipation in Russia

RSDLP

N Riazanov

Publication of the C.C. RSDLP

Geneva Rue de la Coulouvreniere, 27

1905

On February 19, 1861, a mortal blow was dealt to the old Russia of Nikolaev, that same Russia which, in the words of Belinsky, "presented the most terrible spectacle of a country where people trade in people, without having for this even the justification which the American planters slyly use, asserting that the Negro is not a man; a country where people call themselves not by names, but by nicknames: Vanka, Vaska, Stepka, Palashka; a country where, finally, there are not only no guarantees for the individual, honor and property, but there is not even any police order, but only a huge corporation of various official thieves and robbers."

If from 1861 to 1881 February 19th was still an official holiday, it was only because it coincided with the anniversary of Alexander II's accession to the throne. March 1st, 1881, which for the Meshcherskys and Katkovs was a logical consequence of February 19th, finally provided the reactionaries with the desired opportunity first to weaken the character

of the celebration, which had been strengthened by this day, and then to abandon it altogether. Finally, the years came when the celebration of this day became almost a state crime, when those who had adopted only more decent forms of "corporations of official thieves and robbers" of all degrees began to see in this a personal insult to themselves.

Contrary to one of those numerous legends that have already managed, within a very short period, to form around the liberation of the peasants, this day and 44 years ago yes It hardly seemed to have a festive character. Let us recall the following curious fact: the original draft of the manifesto on the declaration of freedom stated: "On this joyful day for us and for all our faithful subjects." In the draft of the manifesto, belonging to Metropolitan Philaret, this passage was omitted. In a special note submitted by him, he explained the reasons that compelled him to do this: "I did not mention joy, lest a word be spoken on behalf of the Tsar that many of the faithful would not sympathize with." And indeed, on this day, Russia was far from joyful. The declaration of freedom did not make an impression on contemporaries commensurate with the grandeur and solemnity of this momentous historical event. On the contrary, the first impression was "vaguely uncertain and far from joyful."

This is sufficiently explained by the very circumstances in which the declaration of freedom took place. The "liberators" themselves seemed to distrust their mission of liberation and feared the liberated. The enormous "corporation of various official and non-official thieves and robbers" made every preparation to defend themselves, not from slave owners, not from landowners—no! Our "corporation" did not fear these enemies, but precisely from those peasants to whom, it seemed, they could only thank and rejoice. Long before the declaration of freedom, Yakov Rostovtsev, an "enthusiast" who, out of love for the truth, betrayed his Decembrist comrades, drew up a project for temporary general governors, provided with extraordinary powers to pacify the rebels. When Lanskoy objected to this project, asserting that the people not only did not resist, but were fully sympathetic to the intentions of the government, the Tsar-Liberator, who so boundlessly loved his people, replied: "All this is so while the people are in anticipation, but who can guarantee that "When the new regulations are put into effect and the people see that their expectations, that is, freedom, in their understanding, have not been fulfilled, will not a moment of disappointment come for them? Then it will be too late to send special persons from here to pacify them. They must already be in place."

Everything that happened in the matter of the liberation of the peasants from October 10, 1860 to March 5, 1861, i.e. from the day the editorial committees were closed until the publication of the manifesto of February 19, was shrouded in impenetrable secrecy even for the majority of members of the former editorial committees.

Retinue generals and aide-de-camp of colonel rank were sent to all provinces and were ordered to serve with the governors. In view of possible popular unrest during liberation, the following orders were issued to the troops: 1) Instructions to military ranks or teams appointed for the execution of cities, towns, and villages in the western provinces. 2) Instructions to military commanders in cases of using troops to pacify popular unrest and disorder. 3) Granting the chief commanders of the western provinces the right to bring those guilty of disorder to military court and to carry out sentences immediately. 4) Temporary order of the district police, allowance for the use of military force in emergency situations to suppress and end disorder.

In Moscow, foot and mounted patrols with loaded guns were walking around on a sunny day. The precautions taken were almost greater than in St. Petersburg. And there they seemed to be preparing for a terrible invasion of enemy forces. On March 4, the military governor general Ignatiev sent out instructions to the regiments with detailed instructions on which regiments should be assigned to which police units of the city; the regiments were ordered not to leave and be on the alert all the time on March 5th. The police were armed with revolvers. And nothing characterizes the mood of the venerable "noble corporation of official and unofficial thieves and robbers" so vividly as the fact that on March 5th, at the very time when the solemn news of the liberation of the serf people was being read in churches, the janitors who had carelessly spoken a few days earlier about the upcoming proclamation of freedom were cruelly "punished on the body"…

A mood of anxiety was also felt in the Winter Palace. Like a gang of "thieves and robbers" who had just committed a major robbery and were expecting retribution at any moment, the palace's inhabitants awaited the results of the declaration of freedom with bated breath. The people gathered in the winter palace awaiting the sovereign's exit were obviously restless. A dull rumble, like a shot, was heard; the governor-general sent to find out what was going on. He was informed… that a lump of snow had been thrown from the palace roof. A few moments later, the ringing of bells was heard; again the courier rushed headlong and, returning, reported that the bells had rung at St. Isaac's on the occasion of a priest's funeral. And the "thieves and robbers" breathed a sigh of relief…

"Letters without an Address" by N. G. Chernyshevsky and articles by N. A. Dobrolyubov show that even those who worked hardest to bring this long-awaited day closer greeted it without much enthusiasm. N. Ogarev dubbed the Statute of February 19 "the new serfdom," and M. L. Mikhailov issued his proclamation "To the Young Generation." A secret revolutionary society, "Land and Freedom," was organized.

The 19 February statute was not recognized by the people either. It was met with disorder and unrest throughout Russia. The people, who had so passionately awaited freedom, rejected it and demanded another manifesto. The answer to their demands There were bullets, bayonets, and rods. From the report on the activities of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, which rather glosses over the facts, we see that in the first two years - from February 19, 1861 to 1863

There were 1,100 peasant revolts in 29 provinces, many of which were suppressed only by force of arms. In the estate of Count Apraksin, in Bezdna, Kazan province, 5,000 peasants rebelled, refusing to recognize the new will. Troops were sent to suppress the uprising, during which 55 peasants were killed and 77 wounded. A military court was appointed over the alleged leader of the peasants, Anton Petrov, which sentenced him to death by firing squad. In the Penza province, in the village of Chernogai, three were killed, 18 wounded; In the village of Kandevka, eight were killed and 27 wounded; 26 people were sentenced to hard labor, with punishment by running the gauntlet; 78 people were exiled, the rest

Those imprisoned, punished with rods, etc. In the Stankevich estate in the Voronezh province, 40 peasants were killed.

This is how the people greeted the freedom "granted" to them, and how dearly it cost them!

II.

What was wrong with this "new will" that made the people so stubbornly reject it?

When our great satirist says that all the efforts of the "liberators" were aimed at "ensuring that the peasant would feel as much as possible, and the landowner would sense as little as possible," these words may seem like an exaggeration. But they constitute only a paraphrase of the rules that Alexander II "ordered" the Main Committee to adopt for proper guidance: 1)

Alexander II borrowed these three conditions from Rostovtsev's petitions to him, giving them a more "precise" formulation. When considering and, subsequently, when considering the legal requirements of the work, it is necessary to observe three conditions:

1) So that the peasant, upon publication of the Regulation, immediately feels that his life has improved;

2) So that the landowner can immediately be reassured that his interests are protected;

3) So that local authorities do not hesitate for a minute";

This serpentinely wise program was brilliantly carried out. The best proof of this is, by the way, the long-running debate about whether the material situation of the peasantry improved after the fall of serfdom or not.

For a long time, and even now, the view has not completely disappeared, according to which the liberation of the peasants from serfdom took place in Russia on completely different principles than in Western Europe. In addition to personal freedom, our serfs, they say, received land.

But this is one of those prejudices that are so often found among "originalists," who forget that "originality" in the development of a given historical process does not yet prove its "originality," and that "originality" itself presupposes a community of basic forms and tendencies of social development.

Even in Western Europe, the emancipation of the peasant's person was not always and not everywhere accompanied by the expropriation of the peasant land. The process of expropriation often lasted no less than the process of emancipation. Thus, for example, in England the process of emancipation lasted until the second half of the 17th century, and the process of expropriation was completed only in the 19th century. In France, the process of emancipation, which began in the 14th century, was finally completed in 1789. The attempt to impose exemption on the peasants…The attempt to make payments for the land remaining in their possession ended in failure. The decree of the Convention of July 17, 1793, freed the peasants' lands from all obligations and payments. The advantages that Marx described as the French revolutionary method also manifested themselves in the liberation of the peasants.

Already in neighboring Germany, the process of emancipation, which officially began in 1811, lasted for several decades and, although it was given a fundamental impetus by the March Revolution, even in 1890 the famous historian of German peasants Knapp could not say with certainty whether the relations between landowners and peasants in some parts of East Prussia had already been finally regulated, in other words, whether serfdom had already been finally liquidated there. Of the land that had once been in the possession of the German peasant, only half remained at his disposal, and for this he had to pay hundreds of millions of marks. The "Silesian billion" corresponded to similar billions in other provinces of Prussia. The Prussian Junkers tenaciously clung to the peasant land.

The emancipation of the Russian peasantry did not occur overnight. It goes without saying that serfdom remained in full force throughout the entire period when charters were drawn up, i.e., agreements defining the land rights of the peasants and the future obligations of the "temporarily obligated."

And not at all in contrast to Western Europe, but exactly the same as in Prussia, the transition of the peasants to redemption could take place only at the request or with the consent of the landowners, who, of course, allowed it only on favorable terms for themselves. Before the transition to redemption, the peasants were left in a position of "temporary namely, those obliged." No less than twenty years passed before the "liberators," driven by the revolutionary movement of the seventies, put an end to the "temporary-obligatory relations" by making redemption obligatory. And to this day, serfdom has not yet been completely abolished in all corners and nooks of our vast fatherland!

Isn't it strange, after all this, to hear from the mouth of even such an outstanding scientist as P. Millyukov the following words:

"It took centuries to destroy the stronghold of medieval serfdom (in Western Europe), while one stroke of the pen was completely sufficient to overthrow the rotten edifice of lordly tyranny"!?

And this is all the more strange because to this day a living remnant of these serfdom relations has been preserved - redemption payments, this "tribute imposed on social development", which has more than compensated for all the old duties of the peasants and replaced several tens of thousands of leeches with one monstrous vampire, sucking all the blood from the dispossessed and ruined peasantry.

And although Nicholas I, as we shall now see, could already explain to himself the fact that "man became a thing" through "cunning and deceit on the one hand and ignorance on the other," the peasants were forced to pay even for liberation from personal dependence. The ransom payments, as even such moderate researchers as L. Khodsky admit, also contained, in a disguised form, the ransom of the serf's person.

Our historians still do not understand or do not want to understand that the situation of February 19 was an act of expropriation of the peasant population: the peasants were not allocated, but deprived. "We are yours, and the land is ours" - this is how the serfs formulated their relationship to their masters. This is serfdom The nobility put forward a completely different theory of serfdom and noble land ownership. It is formulated in the following words of Nicholas I, which this "first nobleman" said to his fellow nobles: "Now I will speak to you, not as the sovereign, but as the first nobleman of the empire. The land belongs to us by right, because we acquired it with our blood, shed for the state, but I do not understand how a person became a thing, and I cannot explain this to myself otherwise than by cunning and deceit on the one hand and ignorance on the other." In other words: the land is ours, but the peasants are not ours. This "theory", of course, seems to be considerably softened in comparison with the "theory" according to which both the peasants and the land are "ours". In this "softening" lies all that "progress" which brings such calf-like delight to bourgeois historians.

Recent historical research has shown that the peasant "theory" holds up to criticism more readily than the noble one. Landownership by the nobility, or landlords, was preceded by free peasant landownership. The more dominant agriculture became in the social process of production, the more strongly the social division of labor developed, and the more sharply the functions of producers and "guardians" differentiated. A free peasant devotes part of his labor, either in kind or in the form of work, to the maintenance of his "guardians." But this labor is performed by the peasants on their own land, which is in their communal ownership. Over time, these obligations become consolidated. "Everywhere," says Marx, "corvée labor very rarely turns out to have arisen from serfdom; on the contrary, for the most part, serfdom turns out to have developed from corvée labor."

yours, and the land is ours." But the other side interprets these relations quite differently. As the monetary economy develops, as the land begins to acquire value, the former lord, who has already managed to settle on the land, becomes a landowner. If previously only the personal services of free peasants belonged to him "by right," now the peasants' "duties"

prove that they are sitting on his land: otherwise, why would they fulfill these duties? "The labor of free farmers on their own land, which was in their communal ownership, is transformed into corvee labor for those who have taken away their common property." (Marx). Only through the legal fiction of communal lands, pastures, forests, waters, etc., which were in the undivided use of all members of the community, are transformed into the property of the landowner, the feudal lord. The fact that the peasants have the right to use all these lands free of charge begins to serve as proof of special "favor" on the part of the landowner.

A similar process took place in the relationship between Russian peasants and landowners. Contrary to the opinion of V. Ilyin, throughout the entire period of serfdom, landowners did not allocate land to peasants, but rather deprived them of it, (V. Ilyin, The Development of Capitalism in Russia). The peasants' right to use the "lord's" forests was increasingly regulated, and landowners' arable land was increasingly expanded at the expense of the peasants', and peasant land was increasingly subject to expropriation. Despite the peasants' protests, their land became the property of the nobility or the state. Only the regulation of February 19th finally sanctified the right of landowners to lands that had never belonged to them, but it finally deprived the peasants of the right to use the forest and all communal lands which the landowners did not manage to deprive them of during the entire period of serfdom.

And the fact that these cuts were made should have been acknowledged by the editorial commissions, which, when determining the lower sizes of the allotments, made the false assurance that "in the Great Russian provinces, the confiscation of land from the peasants was not a general phenomenon, but was a rare exception," and destroying this statement with the reservation that "in the majority of cases the allotment was not destroyed, but only reduced to form landowners' arable land." And in this sense it can be said that the Statute of February 19 ended the centuries-long operation of "cutting" peasant lands with a single colossal "cut" and to the mass of "cuts" carried out before 1861, i.e. before the abolition of serfdom, it added the notorious "cuts" carried out during the abolition of serfdom.

And nothing was more stubbornly sought by our landowners, not the "serf-owners," but the enlightened liberals, than recognition by law that all the land in the peasants' use belonged to them, that they were being extremely generous when they granted them plots of their own land in exchange for ransom. The so-called "sacrifice of the nobility" was the

peasantry's sacrifice in the name of the interests of the all-Russian nobility. As always, it sacrificed the peasant's wealth on the altar of the fatherland.

And only for such researchers as P. Struve, who, following the defenders of the interests of our landownership, asserts that "the peasants never sat on their land," is it possible to idealize the role of the nobility in the era of the liberation of the peasants.

Before liberation, the nobles "owned" 105 million dessiatines. By ceding part of this land, the nobles generously ceded what did not belong to them. Starting from the worst reactionaries

From the ditch to the very red liberals, the nobility made every effort to retain not only the old lordly arable land, but, as I have already said, to cut off as much as possible of the land that had been in the economic use of the peasants under serfdom. All the disputes, for example, that took place in provincial committees and editorial commissions, revolved around the question of how much land could be cut off from the peasants without the risk of provoking a general uprising. The struggle that Ivanyukov and other historians, especially Dzhanshiev, depict as a struggle between serf-owners and liberals, was in fact only a struggle between wolves who knew no limits in their greed and more moderate, cunning foxes.

It is difficult to say to what extent the peasants were robbed on February 19, 1861. Anything could happen. The conditions under which the peasants were liberated varied greatly, but, for all their diversity, they boiled down to the desire to rob the peasants, one way or another.

From the data cited by P. Milyukov, it is evident that the noble committees wanted to cut off half of the land allotted to the peasants, but they had to settle for a general fifth. And without risking a major error, one can make the following proposition: the more land was cut off from the peasants before the abolition of serfdom, the less was cut off after its abolition.

The February 19th statute, contrary to our liberal apologists for the "era of great reforms," was a great act of one-time expropriation of the peasantry in favor of the nobility; it was, at the same time, the final act of a centuries-long process of violent expropriation of the peasantry. It was to be followed by an era of "peaceful" expropriations. This "great" ex-

propriation took on a frankly brazen form in the so-called "gift" or "beggarly" allotment. Peasants who agreed to accept 1/4 of the designated allotment thereby recognized themselves as completely free from any obligations to the landlord authorities. And hundreds of thousands of peasants (about a million) hastened to take advantage of this method to quickly end their relations with the "generous lords."

Millions of house servants were set free without a stake or a homestead. The same unceremonious treatment was meted out to the peasant workers of the mines. They were left practically without land.

This is how the Russian peasants were "endowed" on the glorious day of February 19, 1861 by the "unforgettable" "tsar-liberator"!

But even if we were to admit, along with P. Struve, that "neither the peasants of Kievan Rus' nor the peasants of Muscovite Rus' were landowners, that they cultivated the land of others, private owners or princes," then even in this case no small dose of hypocrisy is needed to speak of material sacrifices on the part of the nobility. We would not call the sale of one's property at a price almost two or three times higher than its actual value a "sacrifice"!

And such a "sacrifice" was the notorious redemption operation. Redemption was permitted, even at the request of the peasants, only with the consent of the landowner; landowners could demand redemption without the consent of the peasants, in a word, whenever it was advantageous to them. We now give the floor to P. Milyukov. Although he is convinced that serfdom was abolished in our country with one "handwriting", that the Russian state, unlike others, was not the result of class differentiation.

on the contrary, it itself created classes, he still feels the entire class lining of the redemption operations.

"Once the idea of obligation was eliminated, selling land to peasants could even become a profitable operation for landowners. Everything depended on the terms of the sale. He could profitably cede to a peasant such a small plot of land that in itself would not provide him with the means for subsistence and for paying duties… In the northern, non-grass-beard half of Russia, parting with the land was even easier for a landowner. Here, for the most part, he already did not engage in farming and did not even live in the village, but received from the peasants, for all their obligations, a round figure of "otrok." The difficulty in

unraveling the serfdom relationship lay elsewhere. The landowner had no use for the land, since little could be obtained from it; but the peasant in this area also earned his lord's rent not from the land, but from the industries that had long served as a support for agriculture here. Consequently, by giving the peasant the land for what it was worth here, the landowner would not compensate himself for the loss of the rent; one way or another, he had to seek compensation not only for the land, but also for the right he was losing to the peasant's industrial labor. In the latter case, the owner directly expected to receive a ransom for the serf's person."

The last task was brilliantly accomplished. Until 1859, the "governing corporation" still did not want to abandon the idea of taking all the land from the peasants. But in order to finally reconcile the "redemptionists" with the need to make a "material sacrifice," it was necessary to arrange the redemption operation in such a way that it would more than compensate the "owner" both for the person of the serf he was losing and for the land with which he "endowed" the peasants. The redemption sum It had to represent not only the value of the land, but also the capitalized value of labor power. The real price of land increased two or three times, and it was only necessary to devise a way to force the peasants to voluntarily agree to a deal that was disadvantageous to them. And for a long time our people-loving liberals, all ardent defenders of the idea of redemption, racked their brains until they found such a means, until they devised a way to preserve innocence and acquire capital.

What did this measure consist of? As is well known, the Regulation established two norms for the per capita allotment: one represented the highest size of the per capita allotment (the census soul), the other the lower. The lower size was everywhere equal to 1/8 of the highest. Where the allotments in use by the peasants were higher than those specified, there the cuts were made. There was not a single locality where these cuts were not made. In the large estates, that is, in the estates of the most influential part of the nobility, to whom the majority of serfs belonged, the peasants received an allotment almost equal to the lower norm.

A corresponding tax was assigned for the allocated allotment. The highest allotment for each locality corresponded to the highest tax per capita: for example, for estates located no further than 25 versts from St. Petersburg - 12 rubles, for the rest, as well as for the Moscow, Yaroslavl, and other provinces - 10 rubles. But how was this tax calculated based on the number of dessiatines in the event of its decrease in comparison with the highest allotment? Probably directly proportional to the decrease in the allotment? Not at all! That would be

too simple. The calculation was made differently: in the first, non-black earth zone, six rubles were allocated to the first dessiatine of the twelve-ruble quitrent, i.e., half of the entire quitrent. For the second dessiatine of the allocated allotment, 14 of the highest quitrent, i.e., In this case, three rubles, and the remaining 1/4 of the dues was distributed among all the remaining dessiatinas of the allotment. Thus, already the first two dessiatinas accounted for 3/4 of the dues, and when switching to redemption, 3/4 of all redemption payments. Clearly, this method of calculating redemption payments was devised to discourage peasants in the non-chernozem zone, where dues were often obtained through non-agricultural industries, from giving up the land. Having taken one dessiatina, the peasant no longer had any reason to give up the rest: only the first was burdensome. This method also benefited the landowners of the black soil zone, who seized upon it with joy. After all, they, unlike the non-black soil zone, were thus given a premium for their insufficient "allocation" of land to the peasants.

What "quick-witted Newton" came up with this method? Was it not the "serf-owners" who put forward this cunning Odysseus from among yourselves? No. They were the red liberals of Tver. They were, in general, ardent defenders of the ransom idea and, as we see, found a way to calm all the fears and anxieties of the "serf-owners" and clearly demonstrated how far they were from the desire to "rob the landowners."

Let us listen to their leader, Unkovsky, who, in the words of Dzhanshiev, gained "loud all-Russian fame for his honest, courageous, noble activities for the benefit of the people."

"When it came to resolving the question of how to determine the amount of the quitrent, and, consequently, its capitalization for redemption, we all stood in Soupik. The serfs demanded the production of a ka-tsastra, and the matter would have dragged on for many years. We had no grounds for this. Then Modest Vorobyov got us out of this serious difficulty. He proposed a system that was accepted not only by us, but also by

19

and the government. The editorial commissions only changed the calculation, lowering the quitrent slightly for the first dessiatines and raising it for the third and fourth, but the idea was given by the late Vorobiev in order to speed things up. We have the testimony of another leading figure among the "Tver liberals," A. Golovachev: "Indeed, Vorobiev proposed determining the monetary duty for a four-dessiatine allotment of peasants at nine

rubles, assigning a larger sum to the first dessiatine and lowering it for the second, third, and fourth." Is it any wonder that after this the majority and minority of the Tver Committee, the liberals and the "serf-owners", so touchingly agreed on the definition of the peasants' duties!

Thus, it is to the liberal Tverites, the "eagles of the memorable era," as Kavelin calls them, that the Russian peasantry owes gratitude for the disproportion between the redemption payments and the profitability of the peasant land, which was so thoroughly demonstrated by the late Janson. Thus, in the Novgorod province, with the highest allotment, payments amounted to 180-210% of the income, with the lowest 275-365%, in the Moscow province 205%, in the arch-liberal Tver province. 252%, in Smolensk 220%, in Kostroma 240%, in Pskov 213%, in Vladimir 2760%, in Vyatka - 2000%.

And only under the baton of the "People's Will" did the government finally decide, by decree of December 28, 1881, to reduce this disproportionate burden and finally introduce obligatory redemption, in other words, to put an end to formal serfdom in the person of the so-called "temporarily obligated" peasants. Thus, the Polish uprising forced the government already in 1863 to lower redemption payments in the southwestern and western provinces and make redemption obligatory.

How much money did the nobles receive for the land that never belonged to them?

billion rubles, since from 1862 to January 1, 1894, 895,879,478 rubles ended up in the pockets of the "magnanimous" landowners. And the "tsar-liberator" was not hypocritical, he once said at a meeting of the State Council, on January 28, 1861, that "everything that could be done to protect the landowners for a year has been done." He was, however, shown that even more could be done: the State Council managed to further reduce the maximum allotment for many localities and introduced a gift allotment.

The disguised ransom of the peasant's person, the gift or beggarly allotment, the disproportionate redemption payments, large cuts from the land which the peasants used when serfdom fell, the preservation of serfdom for two years, for the entire period of drawing up the charters, its replacement for an indefinite period by "temporarily obligated relations", the final deprivation of almost all pastures, meadows and forests - all this is quite sufficient to explain those "misunderstandings" or, in unofficial language, those revolts that

accompanied the entry into force of Regulation 19 February. In the words of a peasant friend of mine, they were given not freedom, but freedom. Rods, bullets and sand.

And if Russian emancipation differs in any way from Western European emancipation, it is only in the large scale on which the expropriation of the peasantry was carried out and the brazen hypocrisy with which the act of the most shameless robbery was covered up with phraseology cheaper than your liberalism!

Liberated, but not entirely, legally, disarmed economically, the peasantry was abandoned to the complete mercy of the landowners. Within ten years, the tax commission had to testify to the complete ruin of the peasantry, and within 15 years, it, through the lips of Pyotr Alekseev, painted the following picture of their situation: "If we look back, we are completely disappointed, and if we recall the unforgettable day supposed for the Russian people, the day on which they, with outstretched arms, full of a feeling of joy and hope to ease their future fate, thank God - February 19. And what did the Tsar and the government do? And for us this was only a dream and a wish!.. This peasant reform of February 19, 1861, a reform "granted", although necessary, does not provide for the most basic needs of the peasant. We are still left without a piece of bread, with scraps of worthless land and have become dependent on the capitalist."

IV.

"Granted," although necessary! Alekseev was absolutely right: the reform of February 19 was a historical necessity. And it was "granted" precisely because the ruling classes had no other choice. Goy

As in Western Europe, as in Japan, the decline of serfdom was conditioned by a fundamental change in socio-economic relations. The "natural" economy increasingly gave way to a monetary economy, simple commodity circulation increasingly transitioned to capitalist commodity circulation, and surplus product increasingly took the form of surplus value. The "national economy" or rather the serfdom system with its characteristic corvee relations is being replaced by a socio-economic system, which is the harbinger of capitalism with the exploitation of the "free" worker: "capitalism on a corvee basis" is rapidly developing.

The nature of Russia's participation in foreign trade is changing. The challenges it throws out onto the world stage Russia takes part in the first world exhibition in London. Finally, in 1857, Russia receives its capitalist "baptism": very little affected by the crisis of the 1840s, it is already experiencing to a rather strong degree the influence of the world crisis of the 1850s. These profound changes in the socio-economic structure of the country, in turn, caused no less profound changes in the class structure of the entire society.

A new class of industrial entrepreneurs emerged, for whom serfdom was an intolerable burden. Landowners' factories could not withstand the competition of hired labor, and by the 1840s they began to gradually close. Things were no better at the so-called possession factories and plants. Entangled in a web of government regulation, with no control over their labor force, these factories and plants significantly declined in value. But factories… Those working as hired labor are developing more and more rapidly, and at the same time the number of hired workers is increasing. And the government begins to be "concerned" about the fate of trade and industry comparatively earlier. In the speech I have already quoted, Nicholas says that "serfdom is the reason why we have no trade or industry." In the notes of the Slavophiles, this motif is a constant refrain: serfdom hinders "enterprise," retards the circulation of capital, etc., etc.

Even more profound changes were caused by the aforementioned economic development among the ruling class, among the nobility. The more the category of exchange value intrudes into the old corvée relations, the sooner the old serf economy is replaced by a capitalist economy on a barracks basis, the more the old feudal lord is transformed into The more money a modern farmer has, the more urgently he needs it. And if at the beginning of the 19th century, pledging an estate seemed like a complicated and daring undertaking, then by the second quarter, landowners were beginning to carry out this operation in a race. Already in 1843, 5,575,515 male souls were mortgaged in the state loan bank and safe treasuries, in 1852 5,843,765 male souls, and since according to the ninth census (1851) the total number of serfs was 10,708,856 male souls, then 54% of the serfs were mortgaged. By January 1, 1856, the number of mortgaged souls already amounted to 6,028,794. It is understandable how the "noble" gentry wanted to be freed from paying interest on these debts, and also to acquire "the capital necessary to support the landowners' farms and adapt them for cultivation by hired hands"(Unkov's words). We have already seen how the leader of the Tver liberals, in whose opinion "justice itself demanded that, upon the liberation of the peasants, the landowners be rewarded both for the land leaving their possession and for

the liberated peasants themselves," achieved this goal and how he managed to reconcile even the black soil landowners with the idea of liberating the peasants with their land.

Economy with Monetary Affairs that a whole series of obligations towards their serfs were now "unbearable" for landowners. "Landowners," in a note from 1845, such an inveterate reactionary as the Minister of Internal Affairs, Perovsky, (Thus wrote in the replacement[?]) themselves began to understand that the peasants were a burden to them and that it would be desirable to change these mutually disadvantageous relations. This was gradually led to by the increased value and shortage of land, the uncertainty of peasant obligations and the resulting discord, frequent crop failures and the heavy duty of feeding the peasants in such cases at their own expense, the carelessness of the peasant who, belonging to the master and accustomed to seeing him as his guardian, does not take care of himself."

Of particular significance was the rise in land value in the central and southern black earth belt. Mass production of grain, both for export and for distilling and beet cultivation, which, according to Samarin, had a huge impact on the right-bank Ukraine, generated a demand for hired labor and clearly demonstrated its profitability. "Experiments in cultivating land, says the same Perovsky, with hired people in the provinces of Saratov, Tambov, Penza, Voronezh and others showed that where there is no shortage of hands, the owner of uninhabited land with such a farm remained in the black against the landowners."

The process of adaptation to new conditions was accompanied by a process of differentiation among the nobility itself. (According to the tables compiled by Keppen, in 1834 there were 1,453 landowner families owning 1,000 or more souls. They owned about 1/3 of all serfs, namely 3,556,959 census-listed souls, together with 2,273 landowners who owned 1,562,831-5,119,790 census-listed souls, i.e. more than half of all serfs. They were followed by landowners who owned from 100 to 500 souls. There were 16,740 of them with 3,634,194 census-listed souls) Large landowners adapted to the new conditions most easily, while the small landowners had a harder time. And nowhere was the situation of the peasants as bad as among the latter. Of course, the number of these peasants was very small. Of the total number of 106,000 small landowners, 17,000 did not have any land at all and owned only people registered with houses, 58,000 owned an average of 49. And some owned 77 census souls, and 31,000 owned Prince Vasilchikov, from whom I borrowed this data, made a very interesting remark:

"In recent times, in the 1830s and 1840s, this class of small landed gentry made enormous strides in education, perhaps even more so than the upper nobility. Taking advantage of the educational resources concentrated in the capitals and cities, young people completed higher education courses, and from them gradually emerged scholars and writers, artists, army officers and civil servants, nobles by birth and tribe, but who constituted the main opposition to serfdom and the aristocratic dominance of large landownership." From this sphere came the most radical figures of the 1840s and 1860s, and they also provided the main contingent of future "repentant nobles." Moderate elements among our "emancipators," as has already been noted by Romanovich-Slavatinsky, almost all came from the ranks of the middle nobility. (In Pushkin one can find many passages that testify to how great was the difference of interests among the nobility itself, but it was especially vividly reflected in the poetry of M. Lermontov, who was brought up in an atmosphere permeated with hatred of "the game of fortune of offended families against the arrogant descendants of all sorts of "orderlies and singers of the Ukrainians," as Pushkinch, himself "a fragment of humiliated families," contemptuously called them).

In the general process of disintegration of the old social relations, the clergy did not survive either. The lower, mainly rural clergy suffered especially hard. Although "burdened with a large family," rural priests could still somehow make ends meet as long as natural economy prevailed. But with the invasion of the "enemy force," everything changed. Excess "consumer values," previously generously given to God and his servants for lack of a market, were now converted into cash, and the share of the rural - Only pitiful crumbs remained of the rural clergy. The OPO is vigorously selecting from its ranks ever new proletarians, who fill the seminaries and academies, and in the persons of the "raznochintsy" together with the "repentant nobles" constitute the main cadres of the "thinking proletariat." Already in the peasant movements of the Vologda province, as in a significant part of other similar movements at the end of the 18th century and in the 19th century, the rural clergy—"the same peasants, only literate," as Pozdyev puts it—played a major role in favor of the peasants.

We see that the ground for the "great reform" was fully prepared. But even if "reform" were a thousand times necessary, it is "given" only when it is urgently and very insistently "demanded." Even Radishchev, one of the first martyrs of the people's cause in Russia, said that the people will gain freedom "if they desire it." And we will now see that the same socio-political process that changed and reshuffled the class relations of the serf social

system had no less a powerful effect on the people and stimulated in them the "desire" to do away with serfdom.

The enslavement of the Russian peasant was as little the result of "a single pen stroke" as his emancipation. Caused by changes in the socio-economic structure of society, this process was far from "peaceful." Stenka Razin's rebellion demonstrates how difficult it was to bind the Russian peasantry to the land. But as long as serfdom was based on subsistence farming, and as long as the main incentive for landowner management was to satisfy the needs of the landowner and his family, the relationship between the landowner and the peasants was still entirely patriarchal. The landowner and landowner's wife were "their own father and mother", benefactors, and the peasants were their children, whom "If they were 'admonished' from time to time, it was always in moderation." All this changed as soon as surplus value became the stimulus to production. When, says Marx, peoples whose production still appears in the comparatively lower forms of slave labor, etc., appear on the world market, subject to the laws of capitalist production, and when the sale of their products abroad develops to such a degree that it becomes their main interest, then to the barbaric horrors of slavery and serfdom are added the civilized horrors engendered by excessive labor."

The Pugachev revolt was the first sign of the rebellion provoked by this new process. Paul I was forced to set limits on this greedy pursuit of surplus labor from the peasants, limiting corvee labor—true, only on paper—to three days. Corvee was turning into real penal servitude. The patriarchal character of the old corvee, accompanied by abundant entertainment from the benefactor, is disappearing, as on the part of the "father" a dull place is given to stingy thriftiness. As long as the products obtained by the peasants' corvee settled in the form of reserves in the landowners' barns, granaries, etc., as long as they did not find any market, serfdom stood unshakable. The estates' reserves, a converted form of the old communal reserves, played the role of insurance institutions for the peasants in case of crop failure, gave the landowners the opportunity to feed all sorts of "homeless", the poor, the crippled, thus replacing along with monasteries, almshouses for the poor and disabled. From a "father-benefactor," the landowner, seized by the auri sacra fame, 1) turns into a rural owner, mercilessly sending his own peasants into the world.

But to understand the full bitterness of the peasants, one must remember that alongside the intensification of the exploitation of the serfs' personal labor went the most brazen expropriation of the peasants' land. And what appears to researchers like P. Struve merely to

be an extensive spread of corvee is in fact its intensification, both through an increase in the degree of exploitation of peasant labor and through the expansion of landlord arable land at the expense of the peasants', and the transformation of the peasants into laborers. If the same Struve comes to the conclusion that "it was not serfdom that developed and expanded, but serfdom economy," that "serfdom, as such, did not become more acute," it is only because this "Marxist" never understood how the "contradiction" between the relations of production and their legal framework manifests itself. Not noticing "the desire of the landowner to free himself from his serf laborers in the relatively densely populated black soil center of Russia," he overlooked at the same time the desire of those same landowners to "free" the peasants from their land and the no less strong desire of the peasants to free themselves from their serf owners. The researcher set himself the task of establishing the causes that led to the decline of serfdom, and came to the unexpected conclusion that the serf system was not yet ripe for its decline!

Meanwhile, only a researcher infected with class color blindness can fail to see how, with the growth of capitalist economy on a corvee basis, the "contradiction" between the serf economic system and the serfdom order became more and more acute.

And the best indicator of this aggravation is the struggle of the peasantry against the landowners. This struggle took various forms. Various elements The cops reacted in various ways. The most natural form of protest was escape. This became especially common in the 19th century, and only this, along with the increased mortality rate of serfs, can explain the decline in the number of serfs, as evidenced by the latest censuses. The increase in suicides among serfs is also very significant. Although, according to Romanovich Slavatinsky, serf suicides were often shown in official tables in the column of those who died suddenly (for example, in 1849 there were 6,122 people) and their number is difficult to establish with precision, there is no doubt that these suicides were a fairly common occurrence (Thus, from the cases of the Skvirsky district court it is evident that in the last five years of the existence of serfdom (1865-60) there were 443 cases of suicide, sudden death, etc. in the district; 73.33 per year, and in the first five years after the abolition of serfdom (1861-66) there were 272 cases in total; 45.66 per year).

But the feeling of "offended conscience," expressed in the desire to somehow escape this world of serfdom, is complemented by a more active protest of "outraged honor." From 1816 to 1837, according to official data, 9 landowners were killed, from 1837 to 1855, about 150, with about 80 attempts on their lives. Twenty-seven managers were killed. All

these figures are lower than the reality. The number of arsons cannot be counted. It is also difficult to determine precisely the number of landowners beaten and flogged by the peasants. Although these cases were especially frequent in the last period of the existence of serfdom, the landowners themselves hid the facts that were "scandalous" for them.

The number of peasant revolts also grew, and to a very strong degree. During the reign of Nicholas I, there were 556 of them, i.e., an average of 19 disturbances per year. The number of disturbances grow until the end of the 40s and reaches its maximum in 1848-54.

From 1826 to 1830 there were 41 riots.

Year | Year | Riots

1830 1834 46

1835 1839 59

1840 1844 101

1845 1849 172

1850 1854 137

For disobedience to the landlords were exiled to Siberia serfdoms in the course of the 20th century (1827-1846) - 1030 people (827 men and 203 women).

By the end of the reign of Nicholas I, the peasants' desire to "break free" from the landlords was so strong that the thought of an impending Pugachev revolt was in the air. This desire was particularly evident in the unrest that followed the publication of the manifesto on the formation of a state militia in 1854. A rumor spread among the serfs, something that had never happened before in such cases, that anyone who signed up for the militia would receive freedom and land. It was in vain that they were told that there was no such law. The peasants continued to be uneasy.

All these disturbances, menacing harbingers of the approaching storm, sufficiently demonstrated, in the words of Ivanyukov, "how intense was the people's expectation of imminent liberation from serfdom and what a flammable soil the peasant class represented

at that time." Is it necessary to further recall the often quoted words of Alexander II to the Moscow nobility: "It is better to abolish serfdom from above than to wait for the time when it will begin to be abolished from below by itself."

We see that Radishchev was right. The people received freedom because Ve "wanted it." We also saw what kind of "unclear" people This "reigned" freedom was overthrown. No matter how strong the rebellion of the peasantry may be at times, it is, by the very conditions of its existence, an element incapable of general political action. Representing only a stratum of the population in which the identity of interests is far from always accompanied by their community, it, like "one man," rises up only when it is struck throughout the country by a general blow, such as a whole series of disasters. Local interests continue to prevail, and therefore, no matter how strong its capacity for resistance may sometimes be, the peasantry easily succumbs to the bait of various handouts. The political activity of the peasantry is very low even at a time when the peasantry is still weakly differentiated, and it becomes even less when the peasantry has already been strongly influenced by the monetary economy.

The serf peasantry was no more homogeneous than the pre-Reform nobility. Even then, it was already fragmented into various territorial groups with distinct, albeit homogeneous, interests. In the provinces of the non-chernozem zone, the vast majority of peasants were on quitrent. The main income derived from serfs consisted of the income they earned from non-agricultural industries. In these provinces, many peasants strove above all to free themselves from their personal dependence and did not particularly value land. The landowners, on the contrary, as we saw in the example of Unkovsky, were eager to impose sands and swamps on the peasants in order to obtain a ransom for the person of the peasant in exchange for this useless land. In the black earth provinces, the vast majority of peasants were on corvee, and they had to fight the landowners' desire to untie them from the land. And if the union of black earth and non-black earth landowners under the aegis of the enlightened old The Tver nobility managed to achieve their goal only because the peasantry was not capable of anything other than isolated "spontaneous" rebellions.

But the peasantry was differentiated not only territorially. By the time serfdom fell, prosperous elements had emerged from the peasantry, standing in sharp antagonism with the rest of the peasantry. In the non-black earth zone, these were small-scale factory owners from among the serf peasants; in the black earth zone, "farm peasants," in whom Peshekhonov, not without reason, sees the ancestors of modern kulaks, and from whom the

burgomasters were chosen; and, furthermore, in both zones, representatives of merchant and usurious capital. These elements also introduced discord into the peasantry and facilitated the old policy of the ruling classes to divide et impega (divide and rule).

This same political passivity of the peasantry condemned representatives of the most radical intelligentsia of the time to the voluntary role of "scarecrow," reminding the ruling classes of the Pugachev rebellion that was upon them with the extremity of their demands. And Chernyshevsky ardently defended projects that he himself considered "unfeasible under the given conditions," knowing full well that there would be plenty of volunteers to defend projects that were "feasible under the given conditions" without him. And if the results did not entirely correspond to his wishes, he and his comrades were nonetheless doing the only revolutionary work: they were putting forward and defending, within the given conditions, the maximum demands that could be made of reality. The main thing had nevertheless been accomplished. The legal emancipation of the working masses was to serve as the first step toward their political, and then toward social, emancipation.

And this confidence found expression in the words of Nekrasov:

I know: in place of the serfs' nets, People have come up with many others. Yes!.. But it is easier for the people to untangle them. Muse! Greet freedom with hope!

But where is the government? Where are those "independent" interests that compelled it to act as "liberator"? One reference to the history of the peasant cause during the reign of Nicholas I is enough to see how timid this autocratic government was when it had to touch upon the interests of the landowners. Only when, due to the aforementioned socio-economic process, it secured the assistance of certain groups of the same landowner class, did it decide—if one can call the cowardly attempts of Alexander II in the fifties decisive—to put on the agenda the question of "improving the life of the landowners' peasants." And it would not be difficult to show how all his steps, zigzags and hesitations were dictated by the vicissitudes of a fierce struggle of interests within the nobility, a struggle which in turn took place in an atmosphere of growing popular indignation, threatening to break through with a powerful stream, the "underground" activities of extreme elements from among the people-loving intelligentsia.

Neither chronic shortages, nor the difficult state of the entire state economy, nor the most reckless embezzlement of public funds, which was committed before everyone's eyes, all

the facts well known to the government, nor the awareness that serfdom was holding back the development of trade and industry could force the government of Nicholas I, this "first nobleman," to go against the nobles. And if the Crimean War, which clearly revealed all these facts and showed, in addition, that while maintaining the serfdom system, the state

The state, this organization of class rule, unable even to protect its own security from "foreign" enemies, served as an impetus for the reform of February 19, only because, as we saw above, it even more clearly revealed the irresistible desire of the peasants to "get rid" of the landowners.

In the heart of Russia an "internal enemy" was rising, admittedly poorly organized, strong only in its hatred of the existing order, weak insofar as its political consciousness was concerned, but an enemy terrifying in its sheer numbers, an enemy that could not be ignored. The state, having proven itself powerless against the "external enemy," thus threatened to prove itself powerless against the "internal" enemy as well.

To preserve class rule, it was necessary to change its form. When, on February 20, 1855, Alexander II convened a council of the empire's highest dignitaries in his office in the Winter Palace to discuss the question of whether to continue the war or conclude peace, Kiselev's opinion prevailed. "It is true," he said, "that the overwhelming majority of the Russian people are deeply imbued with a sense of duty, but there are also nuances that may waver, and therefore they should not place themselves in a hopeless situation that will inevitably lead to conditions even more difficult than the present ones." And if it were not for the threatening mood of the peasantry, which forced the Statute of February 19 to be passed through the appropriate legislative bodies almost by courier, the government would have continued for a long time to play the role of Ivan Vstanka in the hands of various groups of the nobility. But having finally freed itself from fear, it took on with "iron energy" the suppression of the "sedition" that was inflaming "peasant lusts"!

The Crimean War, which lasted for more than two years, served as a prologue to the "era of great reforms"

The disunity between the revolutionary intelligentsia and the rebellious peasantry, incapable of any lasting, widespread organization, enabled the government to escape its "desperate situation" and escamote the hard-won freedom in favor of the "serf-owners." It was even easier to do this in the area of other reforms. With the exception of the judicial

reform, which was dictated by the needs of enhanced civil circulation and in this respect was tailored to the Western European model, all of them were a pitiful parody, capable of misleading only liberal lovers of "comforting phenomena." Thus, the notorious zemstvo reform of 1864, about which our "Tver liberals" still sigh, was only a reward for the nobles for the loss of landlord power.

The February 19th Statute opened the doors to capitalism pur sang (pure-blooded). Economic development increasingly replaced the peasant with the proletarian, the urban worker. In the form of Russian social democracy, the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia unites with "the people," and its ranks increasingly include intelligentsia from the people, the working-class intelligentsia. The contradiction between socio-economic relations and political organization becomes ever stronger and is expressed ever more vividly in new forms of class struggle.

The years that passed after 1861, the years of the unstoppable development of capitalism, passed like a pedagog. "Shades that can waver" were constantly being created and developed. The spontaneous riots of the 40s and 50s were child's play in comparison with the Rostov events of 1902 and the general strikes in the south of Russia in 1903. On February 13, 1861, N. Milyutin received the following from Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna letter: "I consider it my duty to warn you that my people are repeating that if nothing happens on February 19, the mob will move to the palace to demand a final decision. This rumor should be taken seriously: a demonstration would pose a great danger."

The government acted hastily. On February 19, a manifesto on the emancipation of the serfs was signed. Only the form of exploitation changed. There was no talk of eliminating its essence. The working masses received a false freedom.

Forty-four years passed, and on January 9, tens of thousands of St. Petersburg workers marched to the Winter Palace to ask for political freedom for the toiling masses, and along with them, for all of Russia. But the political liberation of the working class is only the first step on the path to social liberation; changing the political organization of class rule must give scope to the working class's struggle to abolish the exploitation of man by man in all its forms. And the government responded with bullets and grapeshot. It won, but not for long.

The cries of protest from the Petersburg workers, the groans of the wounded and dying, were now answered by hundreds of thousands of workers across Russia, including workers

from Helsingfors, Warsaw, Lodz, Vilnius, Moscow, Ekaterinoslav, Kiev, Tiflis, Batum, and Baku. Without distinction of nationality, uniting into one mighty mass, the working class demanded the convocation of a constituent assembly that would put an end to the political slavery of the toiling masses.

And when our dispossessed peasantry learns that along with the demand for political liberation, the Petersburg workers, flesh of flesh, bone of bone of the long-suffering peasantry, have also put forward the demand for a gradual transformation giving all the land to the people, then the days of Russian autocracy are numbered. Revolution in the cities, supported by revolution in the villages and hamlets, is invincible.

On February 19, 1861, a mortal blow was dealt to the feudal Russia of Nicholas I, but the House of Romanov remained unshakable, the Russian autocracy received an influx of fresh forces. On January 9, 1905, a mortal blow was dealt to the Russian autocracy, and in the streams of workers' blood spilled by the last Romanovs, democratic and republican Russia was borngiving all the land to the people, then the days of Russian autocracy are numbered. Revolution in the cities, supported by revolution in the villages and hamlets, is invincible.

On February 19, 1861, a mortal blow was dealt to the feudal Russia of Nicholas I, but the House of Romanov remained unshakable, the Russian autocracy received an influx of fresh forces. On January 9, 1905, a mortal blow was dealt to the Russian autocracy, and in the streams of workers' blood spilled by the last Romanovs, democratic and republican Russia was born

---

Dive Pravdy - Two Truths

Nationalism and Marxism

Essay on the history of the Russian intelligentsia

Preface to the second edition.

Does Russian Marxism represent a product of "parasitic creativity" or, on the contrary, the same necessary link in the development of Russian social thought as the populism of the 1870s? Is it, as V. Ilyin thought, a "rejection of the legacy of the 1870s" or, on the contrary, a reworking of it and further development of the "fundamental tendencies" of revolutionary populism?

I tried to answer these questions in my brochure, written on the occasion of N. Mikhailovsky's fortieth anniversary of literary activity. It is now being reprinted, without any changes or additions.

March 20 1906

—

"Should Russia begin by destroying the rural community and moving towards a capitalist system (as liberal economists want), or, on the contrary, can it assimilate all the fruits of this system without experiencing the suffering that goes with it and develop in accordance with its own historical data?" (Marx).

This question, which in the 1840s divided our intelligentsia into "ours" and "not ours", into the Slav-Vyanophiles and the Westerners, which in the 1860s became a "remarkable article" of Russian criticism, put on the practical ground in the seventies and left its bright stamp on them.

The shackles of serfdom were broken. Russia was freed from the terrible nightmare that had hindered its free development. It could now begin life on new principles, having nothing in common with the accursed past. At its disposal was "the best chance history had ever given a people" to free itself from the torments and sufferings that had bought Western European civilization.

Even for an "undoubted Marxist," the February 19th Regulation was the swan song of the old production process. It interfered, in his opinion, with the application of capital to the land, the fulfillment of its historical mission.

This is because it provided the producers with the tools of labor. Of course, the "Regulation" had its shortcomings, but nevertheless, the principle of the manifesto, the provision of land

to the peasants, stood in absolute contradiction with the principle on which the economic system of Western European states is based. Only after this regulation does the struggle between the two economic forms begin.

But, as we know, there are no events without a trace. The past, whether sad or sweet, has never been allowed to go unpunished by individuals or nations.

What seemed to be the swan song of the national economy turned out to be the "song of triumphant love" of the capitalist system, which arose and developed in the depths not of "national production," but of that socio-economic structure that is best characterized by the name "capitalism on a corvee basis." The regulation sanctified the principle of individual ownership of the instruments of production and only against one's will allowed the existence of communal ownership of one of them, trying, as far as possible, to destroy this remnant of the past. It did not allocate land to the peasants, but rather deprived them of it: it significantly reduced their allotments and deprived them of pastures, forests, and meadows, thus creating all the conditions for a quick, "non-violent" expropriation of the peasants. For the land that remained in their possession, it forced them to pay exorbitant redemption payments, which included, in a disguised form, the redemption of personal dependence. It created a beggarly free allotment. Sans phrases, it dispossessed about 3 million households of land and forgot to allocate land to the Ural mining workers.

Post-reform Russia was, therefore, a blood child, flesh of the flesh and bone of the bone, Russia until 1961. There was not only "room" for the capitalist form: all the conditions for the luxuriant flourishing of the "Western European order" were already present. And only this explains why the "Tax Commission" could note the complete disintegration of peasant farming - after some 10 years.

But what is now clearly visible to us, 30-40 years later, was seen in a different light by contemporaries. For them, Russia was a hero who had just thrown off its shackles; it could now consciously choose the path that best served the interests of the people.

In the midst of the world below, For a free heart there are two paths. Weigh your proud strength, Weigh your firm will, Which one to take?

All that remained for our hero was to "compare" these "two paths" and make a choice. And the choice, it seemed, was not difficult. "There, in the most civilized countries, land

ownership, capital, and labor are separated from each other very sharply, which satisfies the organic theory. This is not the case with us. The overwhelming majority of the population of Russia consists of landowning farmers. In Europe, manufacturing industry is entirely concentrated in the cities. With us, a huge part of it has not separated from rural industry and does not leave the village. With us, a peasant, even if he works in a factory, nevertheless has his own plot of land, to which he returns in the summer and in times of adversity. In Europe, this No, because a real peasant can't be found everywhere. For us, a landless worker is an exception, whereas in the most civilized countries of Europe, things are arranged in the most organic way, and such a phenomenon as a landowner-capitalist-worker has long ceased to exist there. Together

At the same time, Russia is an underdeveloped country, poor in capital and knowledge. In view of all this, two diametrically opposed political programs are possible.

One could demand for Russia a repetition of European history in economic terms: take the land from the peasant and send him to the factories, relocate all manufacturing industry to the cities, and entrust rural activities to small or large non-farming landowners. In this way, various social functions will become isolated. But one can also imagine a different course of events. One can imagine the progressive development of those same economic principles that now exist across the vast expanse of the empire. This would, of course, be an unprecedented experience, but then, we find ourselves in an unprecedented situation. "We represent a people who have hitherto been, so to speak, seconded to civilization. We possess the entire rich experience of Europe, its history, but at the same time we ourselves have only been scratched by civilization. Our civilization arose so late that we have had time to observe the history of others and can conduct our own quite consciously—an advantage which no other people in the world has yet enjoyed to such an extent" (N. Mikhailovsky, Works, Vol. I, pp. 806-807).

It's naive, isn't it? It's become fashionable for us now—oh, we're wise with experience!—to laugh at the people of the seventies for their insane attempts to "turn back the wheel of history." But this laughter only proves an absolute inability to adopt a historical perspective. "We," of course, would have acted differently, but, unfortunately, "we" didn't exist then, and the generation of that time had to decide this question on the basis of the data of their time, through the prism of a given historical moment. They didn't lull themselves with optimistic hopes that "the situation of our worker has nothing in common with the Western process…"lethariate, and therefore there is nothing to fear for the future of Russia". [The

question arises, where are the grounds for such optimism? Was not the European worker in his time in the same position in which he still finds himself? And was not the progress of industry what knocked him out of this position? Let it be proven to us that the European worker has never been the owner of land and the instruments of production, an independent master. (N. Mikhailovsky. Works. Vol. I, p. 695). It is characteristic that this optimism was elevated to the level of a theory by Mr. V.V. just when all hope for a "special" path for Russia had already been lost. N. Mikhailovsky, who still retained this hope, considered it is necessary to rebel against this optimism.]

They were firmly convinced that if they folded their useless arms on their empty chests, "Russia would lose the best chance that history had ever given the people to go through all the fatal successive changes of the capitalist system instead."

The following words, which contain the groan of an entire generation that perished in the struggle with inexorable fate, can evoke neither ridicule nor contemptuous regret, but only deep sadness. "Even if this is truly a fatal mistake and useless madness, a futile effort to stop the incontestable course of history, which will still take its course and mercilessly crush everything that resists it… in history, there are not at all rare cases when people are fatally condemned to useless resistance to a clearly defined and far-reaching historical process. And this is not out of stubbornness, but from the same conviction that sometimes makes a person throw himself into the water to save a drowning person who is obviously beyond rescue, at the risk of drowning himself." (N. K. Mikhailovsky. Literary Memories and Modern Troubles, No. 1, pp. 345-346.)

They were wrong, but subjectively they were right. This —tragedy?— still awaits its historian and artist. It began with a movement among the people and ended with the defeat of the People's Will. Over the course of two decades, the entire world has witnessed the only heroic attempt in world history to turn Russian history off the thorny Western European path, soaked in the blood of countless generations, and direct it along a path that would lead it directly to the kingdom of freedom, equality, and fraternity. [They were crucified and exiled… and called pigs.] (From German) And it is not for us, who have benefited from the dearly bought experience of an entire generation, to join the numerous chorus of those who are trying to throw mud at this generation of titans.

We will not now follow all the twists and turns of this gigantic struggle. We will also abandon the tempting task of tracing its reflection in so-called legal literature, although we

will inevitably have to touch on this issue. And in this literature, N.K. Mikhailovsky unquestionably occupies first place. Throughout the seventies and early eighties, the voice of the dear "profane" was passionately listened to by all those from whose ranks the [Crucified and exiled] were recruited. Together with them, he experiences all the phases of this heroic time and, obedient to its call, faithfully reflects in his articles the entire complex history of this turbulent period. But why did he become the spokesman for the thoughts and aspirations of the best part of our youth? Where is the secret of this extraordinary love? Where is the solution to this astonishing entente between reader and writer? And what is the reason for the rift that began in the 1980s and became so sharply evident in the 1990s?

We do not intend to analyze now the entire literary activity of N. Mikhailovsky. We will have to touch upon many things only in passing. Now he interests us more as a journalist. But this side of his activities would be difficult to understand without a little historical background.

II.

N. Mikhailovsky's literary career began very early, back in 1861, but he began to occupy a place as one of the leaders of social thought only in the late 1860s. The Sturm und Drang period of our literature, the "era of great reforms," ended in 1862. "The contemporary who had so successfully served as the spokesman for the aspirations of the "extreme left," changed his physiognomy. The "Epigones" were far from up to their task.

The great cause of people's liberation, which Sovremennik had passionately and faithfully served from 1857 to 1862, was, one way or another, over. The attempt to discredit the reforms had ended in defeat for the extreme left. Sovremennik was left only, through all sorts of compromises, to defend what it had already "taken from life" and to combat, sometimes in the most clumsy form, the new mood among the youth. True to its old traditions, Sovremennik continued to devote much space to "domestic issues," but all this was laced with a significant dose of opportunism, which was not present in the old articles of Dobrolyubov and Chernyshevsky. Closely following Western European life, it continued to acquaint the Russian public with the workers' movement in the West and, in a curious preface to the translation, made an attempt to recast it in the Russian manner. Dassalev's speech "On the Special Connection, etc.," already on its pages, an attempt was made to calculate how great the debt of the civilized classes to the people is. But the "spirit is alive"

had departed from the magazine, and only a few individuals from the younger generation retained their old sympathies for the magazine.

A huge part of the youth grouped around the "Russian Word". After the peasant question, a new question appeared on the scene, "the question of the young generation" and, as part of it, "the women's question".

From the ruined small and medium-sized estates, whole lines of "young men" have flocked to the city in search of "their own bread." "Difficult times" have arrived for the "thinking proletariat." Social issues are giving way to personal ones. "Society" is fading into the background. It is once again taken for something "given," to which one can only adapt in order to bring the greatest possible dose of benefit under the given conditions.

A special code of life is being developed, from which anything even remotely resembling the outdated morality of the "fathers" is mercilessly discarded. Attitudes toward women are analyzed most meticulously. The "thinking realist" is not concerned with the question of whether he has a right to personal happiness. For him, it is beyond all doubt. Debated is only the question of the forms in which it is most achievable from the point of view of "economy of forces." The question of the people is resolved very simply: We are poor because we are stupid. Only the "unprofitability of ignorance" needs to be proven. Let the "thinking proletarian" accumulate a sufficient amount of "real" knowledge, do not place the burden of duty on his shoulders, and he will "enlighten" the foolish, he will dispel the darkness of prejudices that prevents us at every step from organizing ourselves rationally.

The most striking exponent of this trend among the publicists of the "Russian Word" was Pisarev. In the articles of this brilliant stylist, the "thinking realist" with his ideal of "knowledge, love and work" was portrayed in the most charming colors. And these articles were all the more effective, they captivated the youth all the more because they were written in prison.

The sermon on personal happiness was heard from the casemates of the Peter and Paul Fortress. And the efforts of the "Outsider Satirist" were in vain.

to prove that this ideal is purely individualistic in nature, answering only the question of how to arrange oneself in this world so that one can live well. A legend had already begun to form around Pisarev's name. For a long time, young people were unable to discover in

his brilliant improvised sermons traces of that mental structure that, after his death, was cast in such repulsive forms. They noticed in them only a protest against outdated forms of life; they were carried away by the oppositional spirit that permeated them. This motley mixture of preaching individualistic ideals and instinctive protest against the existing social order is generally characteristic of the "Russian Word." Almost completely leaving aside "internal questions," the publicists of the "Russian Word" in various forms acquainted young people with socialist doctrines. Bourgeois political economy, even in the person of its best representatives, was subjected to the most severe criticism (sometimes surprisingly comical) of the future author of "The Renegades." And in the articles of P. Tkachev—a strange irony of fate—young people could for the first time become acquainted with a viewpoint that was transferred to our literature, like everything good in it, from Western European literature. Back in 1859, the famous German politician Karl Marx formulated it in the most in a precise and definite way." (Note by Tkachev: "These are his actual words: wealth (this is how Tkachev translates Produktionsverhalt nisse), forms the economic structure of society, the main base on which political and legal relations rise in the form of superstructures." R. S. 1865. 12 Bibliographic leaflet p. 31.)

And next to these two magazines, unnoticeably The completely inconspicuous bibliographical journal "Book Herald" languished, where N. Mikhailovsky's "friend-teacher", N. Nozhin, in his reviews of books on natural history, read the farewell to socialism and enthusiastically welcomed anarchy as the most ideal system of social life, in which the social division of labor, the root of all evil, would finally disappear.

Shot on April 4, 1866, not "on reform", as our liberals think, but on reaction, directed at the literature of the threat. "Sovremennik" and "Russian Word" died. They were soon followed by the Book Herald.

A lull set in in literature, as in public life. But it was soon broken. In 1867-68, liberated Russia was struck by a famine such as it had not known in the darkest periods of its serfdom history. It was a bolt from the blue. The government was alarmed, establishing a committee chaired by the future "peacemaker." Commissions were appointed to investigate the state of peasant economy. "Society" also awoke. The liberals, relying on "facts," pointed to the need to complete the work of "great reforms," which had been interrupted for a time, supposedly under the influence of the extreme left, and to engage in positive work.

But this famine made a particularly stunning impression on the younger generation. Before the "commoner" and the "repentant nobleman," who were completely absorbed in matters of personal self-improvement, a picture of national misfortune and general disarray suddenly unfolded with irresistible clarity.

The "misery" of "ten years of reforms" has been laid bare. It is being subjected to merciless criticism. "The emptiness of liberal reforms and the fruitlessness of liberal efforts are becoming all too obvious to everyone." The "ineffectiveness of legal forms of struggle" is quickly becoming clear. A lively discussion begins questions about the relationship of the "individual" to society. The "price of progress" is being calculated. The people, who, it seemed, after several isolated outbreaks had fallen silent, satisfied with the material results of the "greatest reform," have again reminded us of themselves.

The sensitive conscience of youth is faced with the question: do I, raised on the people's dime, have the right to engage in personal self-improvement at a time when these same people are dying of starvation typhus and scurvy? The question arises of how great is the debt owed to the people, and every generation comes to the conclusion that it is an indebted person to the people. A need arises to become more closely acquainted with these people, to study their needs and aspirations. The people's situation becomes the subject of careful study. (Everyone knows how enormously popular Flerovsky's book "The Situation of the Working Class in Russia" was in the seventies and even in the eighties.)

Pisarevshchina is fading into the background: from the phase of development of social thought it is turning into the phase of individual development, from a broad social movement that left its mark on an entire period of the intellectual life of Russian society, it is turning into a circle, provincial. (For a long time after, the question of Pisarev remained a "sore," "unresolved" issue. It was the subject of articles by N. Morozov (M. Protopopov), "Literary Issues of the Day in the Fatherland Legislation of 1977," and by I. Koltsov (of sad memory, L. Tikhomirov). Unresolved Issues, "The Case" of 1981, which caused a lot of noise in its time. Both articles contrasted the individual ideals of Pisarev with the social ideals of Dobrolyubov and Chernyshevsky.)

This unrest could not, of course, fail to be reflected in literature. Founded back in 1867, "Delo" was at first almost a popular-scientific collection, where Pisarev could only write "Essays from History" and "The Italian Peoples", during 1868, was again transformed into a lively periodical with a strong revolutionary coloring. The first role was occupied by P.

Tkachev, who combined in his articles "economic materialism" of a vulgar kind with extreme Jacobinism. In his brilliant article "People of the Future and Heroes of the Bourgeoisie", he gives a legal prologue to the future Nechayevshchina with its principle: "the end justifies the means." This time his literary activity did not last long. Arrested in March 1869, he disappeared for several years, only to reappear in 1872, but as the author of significantly faded articles. "The Case" finally became the organ of provincial young men and women, frightening their jaded fathers and mothers with their radicalism.

For a time, it seemed that the leading position in journalism would pass to "Nedelya." Thanks to the insistence of the late E. I. Konradi, the most energetic and educated representative of the women's movement of that time, the editors agreed to place in the pages of the magazine "Istorical Letters," I. L. Lavrov, who had been exiled to the Vologda province shortly before. In his letters, which even in a scientific sense were an outstanding phenomenon for their time, our unforgettable teacher "awakened in the student youth a sense of responsibility for the unbearable suffering of the masses, brought their idealism to the highest degree and showed them the path of action": having prepared himself as a fighter for national liberation, to go to the masses to share his knowledge with them and, having explained to them the reasons for their unbearable suffering, to call them to fight against the existing order. He taught the youth to respect the masses, those unnoticed heroes of humanity who did not accomplish a single outstanding deed, but before whom, in terms of historical significance, the greatest historical figures are insignificant. {[[Riazanov - Lavrov]]}

"They are the guardians contained within themselves the entire possibility of the future. In a society without them, all historical progress would cease at once." And the youth responded to the ardent call. As a contemporary said, "hundreds of readers were deeply captivated by the Historical Letters": less than a year had passed after their appearance in a separate edition, when in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, and Odessa, that legion of revolutionary "fighters for progress" on whom the deceased placed all his hopes began to form."

In the same "Week" - and almost simultaneously with "Historical Letters" - were published the historical essays of Mikhailov-Scheller, "The Proletarian in France", which for a long time afterwards served as the only source for revolutionary youth to become acquainted with the French movement. G. Skabichevsky, who had since become considerably "wiser", wrote an apology for Lassalle in his article "Heroes of the Pigeon's Flight", directed against the Russian Schulze-Delichs. But "Week" did not hold this position for long. With the departure

of Conradi, the editorial board passed to I. Gaideburov, in whose hands "Nedelya" turned into a "gaideburist and boring" magazine, at times seized by the mania to say something "new".

With the transition of the "Week" to a different editorial board, the first place in the ranks of the radical press moves on. (Of course, at that time and around there were journals in which the extreme left tried to find refuge. Thus, in the same "Women's Herald," which gave shelter to Uspensky's "Rasteryaeva Street," Tkachev had to expound his views on the significance of the economic factor in articles on the women's question, and P. Lavrov wrote articles on the dominance of women in papal Rome or on the French salons of the 18th century and subjected Spencer's philosophy to a rigorous critical analysis in an article on his experience, "Intellectual, Moral, and Physical Education." Both the last article and the article by the same author, "The Tasks of Positivism and Their Solution," published in the soon-to-be-defunct "Contemporary Review," had a strong influence on M. Mikhailovsky and V. Lesevich, who had been orthodox positivists until then. But neither these magazines, nor "Kosmos", founded by Yu. Zhukovsky and M. Antonovich, employees of "Sovremennik", who had parted ways with N. Nekrasov, remained on the literary horizon for long.

The first place in the ranks of the radical press moves on to "Notes of the Fatherland" (purchased by Nekrasov in 1868). The best literary forces are grouped around this magazine, and it becomes the center of gravity for the most responsive and radical part of our youth. "The denial and criticism of the bourgeois system and liberalism… take on an extremely sharp, tense, and charged character. Socialist sympathies, on the one hand, and the glaring facts of life abroad, vividly illustrating the 'system of maximum production,' on the other, irrevocably resolve their negative attitude toward the bourgeois type of social organization and its moral and political doctrine—liberalism. Liberalism is subjected to careful criticism from various points of view and for a wide variety of reasons… The sharp distinction between the interests of society and the interests of the people as the working masses is the unchanging fundamental criterion from the point of view of which all more or less major socio-economic phenomena are examined, studied and illuminated. Thus, socialist sympathies, if not a socialist worldview, undoubtedly serve as the highest authority to which they appeal every time a difficulty arises in solving or posing this or that social problem." (Memoirs of a Landowner) (Materials for the history of the Russian social-revolutionary movement" in the article by Lavrov, Narodniki 73-78). The peasant, the people became the central figure of the entire magazine. Nowhere was the idea of duty to the people reflected so vividly as in this magazine. "It constituted the general background

on which patterns of lyricism, fiction, criticism, philosophy, history, economics and politics were drawn." But even in this magazine, this idea was most vividly reflected in the articles of N. Mikhailovsky.

The question "what to do?" was resolved. We must work for the people. But how to do this? How to understand the complex interweaving of social phenomena? How to separate the true from the false? How to reconcile the inexorable demands of science with the moral sense of responsibility for one's situation? How to unite truth and justice into one inseparable whole?

The past has left us a legacy of words and mottos that seemed to conceal rich meaning. Liberty, equality and fraternity, national wealth, progress—for decades people have struggled in the name of these words, and what happens? National wealth is only the obverse of national poverty; freedom has turned out to be the freedom to die of hunger; progress advances at a devastatingly slow pace and is bought at such a high price that the question involuntarily arises: wouldn't it be better without it? A "fierce, unbridled hostility" toward the existing order flares up in the soul, and the entire being is seized by a "passion for destruction." There is no need for the memory of science, bought with the blood and torment of entire generations! "For us, the thought of radical and ubiquitous destruction is dear. But not only insofar as it can serve the great cause, there is no such thought alone. He who learns revolutionary work from books will always be a revolutionary idler." (Bakunin). And, on the other hand, the representatives of liberalism were carried away with the theory of organic progress, slowly "of gradual development. Gentlemen scientists and professors preached to the youth the omnipotence of science, which, by itself, through the activities of its adherents, gradually improves social relations." (II Axelrod in the article about Lavrov).

We have before us, taken to extremes, attempts to separate "theory" from "practice." On the one hand, we get a "practitioner," a man of "action" par excellence, a pure dove who lacks the "wisdom of the serpent," and on the other, a man of "words," of "theories," who lacks not only the purity of a dove, but also elementary sensitivity, a man who knows neither anger at those who offend nor pity for the offended. Each of us has been there—and who among us has not? - in any youth circle, you know how often these two tishchi meet. Rarely does one of us not fall into one of these extremes at first. And sometimes we'd ruin theory for the glory of practical work, sometimes practical work for the glory of theories and science.

Any such attempt to separate "truth-truth" from "truth-justice," "the truth of the theoretical heaven" from "the truth of the practical earth," is always fraught with danger. We risk, along with the author of "The Essence of Christianity," "regarding as truly human activity only theoretical activity," or only "practical" activity in its narrow, vulgar form, and never "understanding the significance of 'revolutionary,' practical-critical activity."

And among the seventies there were people to whom "noble everyday practice, the highest moral and social ideals always seemed offensively powerless if they turned away from the truth, from science." "I could never believe and now I do not believe," says N. Mikhailovsky, in whose writings the aspirations of this particular group of seventies were most clearly reflected, "that "It was impossible to find a point of view from which truth and justice would appear hand in hand, one complementing the other. In any case, the development of such a point of view is the highest task that can present itself to the human mind, and no effort would be a pity to waste on it. To fearlessly look reality and its reflection, truth, objective truth, in the eye, and, at the same time, to guard truth, justice, subjective truth—such is the task of my whole life. This is not an easy task."

This task is truly difficult. N. Mikhailovsky's subsequent literary career demonstrated that the "point of view" he had developed with such difficulty proved incapable of connecting the truth of the theoretical heavens with the truth of practical earth, and more than once forced him to sacrifice one for the sake of the other. But we are not now interested in the later phase of his literary career. Mikhailovsky now interests us only as the spokesman for a certain current among the youth of the seventies and early eighties. He was dear to this youth precisely because in his writings they found a system of truth that satisfied the demands posed above.

What is this system of the Pravda? We will try to describe it in the words of its author.

The system of Truth requires a principle which 1) would serve as a guiding thread in the study of the surrounding world and, consequently, would provide answers to the questions that naturally arise in every person; which 2) would serve as a guiding thread in practical activity and, consequently, would provide answers to the inquiries of conscience and moral evaluation, which again naturally arise in every person; and which, finally, 3) would do this with such force that the proselyte would be drawn with religious devotion to that in which the principle of the system posits happiness.

All mental, all psychic processes take place in the personality and only in it; only it feels, thinks, suffers, enjoys… All social unions, no matter how loud or prejudicially attractive their names may be, have only a relative value. They should be dear to you insofar as they promote the development of the personality, protect it from suffering, and expand the sphere of its enjoyment. Words like "common cause," "public interests," "common good," should not confuse you at all, because contraband is often smuggled under this flag.

To avoid self-deception and the deception of others, this unconsciousness must be eliminated. Let proud people either understand and openly tell others what precisely they serve, or choose another, higher object of service. This higher object cannot be beauty, truth, or justice, but only the human personality, whole and complete, in which all these abstract categories are combined into a living unity. For purely theoretical areas of human activity, this criterion is always clear and satisfactory. The matter must be posed thus. The mental process takes place within the boundaries of the individual, the personality. These limits are established, on the one hand, by nature, and on the other, by the historical course of events. We are forced to accept natural definitions as they are, without attempting to expand or change them.

Therefore, first of all, we must clarify what boundaries nature has set for our minds. This is precisely what is commonly called the theory of knowledge. Here it is in brief: only relative Truth is accessible to man; an animal with a different organization must understand things differently. Truth, from the human point of view, is not something that corresponds to the nature of things and is obligatory for all beings. Man obtains the elements of Truth.

with the help of five senses, and if he had more or fewer of them, Truth would appear to him completely differently. The boundaries marked by the finger of nature cannot be crossed.

Truth, achieved by all means, which represent these final limits of human personality, is relative Truth; but in practice it is perhaps absolute for man, because it is impossible to rise above it. But the historical course of events adds to the natural determinations and limitations of human personality its own particular, social ones. Tell me to what union you belong, and I will tell you how you view things. Therefore, in practical spheres, the criterion of human personality, due to the complexity of relationships, can lead to great misunderstandings.

We must find in personality an attribute, a quality, that would be inherent to it precisely as a personality and would not depend on any random determinations. Such an attribute is labor, the purposeful exertion of personal energy. Thus, for practical purposes, and not only for them, but for the sake of theoretical clarity, we can substitute in our initial formula, instead of personality, its sole manifestation—labor, the conscious, purposeful expenditure of energy. With further abstraction, the interests of labor become the interests of the people. The people are that social element whose service would bring us closer to the intended goal. The people, not in the sense of a nation, but of the collective body of working people. Labor, the only unifying characteristic of this group of people, does not bring with it any privileges, serving which we risk forging to serve some one-sided element: in labor, personality is expressed most vividly and fully.

But to serve does not mean to be servile. To serve the people does not mean to indulge their ignorance or to accommodate his prejudices. We, "standing on high, like a city upon a hill," we, rich in theoretical knowledge and the historical experience of others, must stand guard over the interests of the people, protect them from the encroachments of avowed enemies and those hypocritical friends who wish to keep them in the darkness of ignorance.

We arrived at this conclusion not only through cold, logical deductions. We also feel a nagging sense of responsibility to the people, an unpayable debt to them for the fact that, through their ox-like toil and bloody sacrifice, we have reached the point of being able to draw these logical conclusions. We can, therefore, say with a clear conscience: we are the intelligentsia because we know a lot, have reflected on much, and by profession we are engaged in politics, art, and journalism. We are cut off from the people by the arduous historical process; we are alien to them, like all so-called civilized people, but we are not their enemies, for our hearts and minds are with them. Heart and mind, notice this combination. This is not a momentary outburst of sentimentality, not those feminine tears of which the song speaks that they are like dew: the sun rises, the dew dries. If the feeling were to cool or become cold under the pressure of natural affairs and affairs, the mind will not waver, and if the mind is wavered, it will support to live a feeling. We now have a system of truth, its justification and socio-psychological prerequisites. It is difficult to deny a certain harmony.

The comprehensive development of the personality (the integrity of the indivisible) - labor as the basic function of the personality - the interests of labor, as an individual - the interests of the working classes, the interests of the working people, the people in the sense of the

totality of the working classes - these are the various links of the theory that strives to connect the ideal with reality, to find in reality itself such a social element, such a social group, which would be most interested in the realization of the ideal presented to us. It is not difficult to indicate the constituent ingredients of this "systems" of truth.

Feuerbach's anthropologism entered into it, (Through the mediation of N. Chernyshevsky, N. Dobrolyubov and P. Lavrov), as did the doctrine of the self-alienating personality, Lassalle's construction of the idea of the working class, refashioned in the Russian manner, ("Everything that Lassalle said about the working class, we transferred to the peasantry, which for us was our dispossessed "fourth estate." We took especially close to heart Lassalle's reasoning that the workers who gave themselves up to the struggle for the interests of their class, in other words, for their own interests, even perform a highly moral act, for in serving the cause of universal human progress, in the present historical era the working class is the bearer of progress, just as the bourgeoisie was the progressive element of the sermon." Debagoriy-Mokrievich, Memories. First Issue, pp. 14-15.) entered into it, as did the duty of the civilized classes to the people, as the main impulse of social activity. These elements entered for the most part unconsciously for the creator of the system himself, who united them into one inseparable whole. The specifically Russian context of this combination made its author forget that all the elements of his system had been developed by Western European thought even before 1844. It should be noted that, in general, the dependence of our literature on Western European literature is much stronger than it sometimes seems to our "independent" thinkers. The same thing often happens to them as to the young man about whom Mr. Mikhailovsky speaks in his memoirs. "Today's young man is already being brought up on much of what at one time cost him great effort and sacrifice. He himself sometimes does not know where this or that thought, this or that feeling came from the state, and it is no wonder that it sometimes seems to him that he has reached them completely independently, that he is the first to proclaim a certain truth."

IV.

The system we have outlined, however, contained a point that, back in the 1870s, gave rise to heated debates between Mr. Mikhailovsky and the Narodniks, in the sense in which the word was then understood (II Ch. and Yuzov). Of course, the interests of the people should serve as the supreme criterion, "everything for the people," but don't we risk diverging from the "opinions" of the people in our actions? How should we act in such a case? Should we go against the "opinions" of the people and arrange their life in accordance with our

"opinions" about their "interests"? Will we not thus become a special kind of bureaucrat, who will decide the fate of the people at our own whim? Will the people not turn away from us if we do not cope with their "means"? Wouldn't it be better to act in accordance with the interests of the people, recognized and expressed by them themselves, that is, in accordance with their opinions?

This literary dispute was a reflection of another dispute that arose among the revolutionary youth. "Everything for the people"—that was the consensus. Then came the disagreements. The Jacobin formula, "everything for the people, but not through the people," especially after the ill-fated Nechayev experience, provoked almost universal indignation. A lack of trust in "common sense and the will of the people," and a view of the people as "a senseless crowd that must be commanded," deeply infuriated the youth. No! "Everything for the people and through the people"—said both peaceful propagandists and rebels alike. Only a revolution carried out by the people themselves has a chance of success.

It is only necessary to explain to the people their interests, to bring their "interests" into harmony with their "opinions"—and the people's social revolution is ensured. This was to be ensured by the peaceful propaganda of socialist ideas among the people. The rebels, in essence, also held this same point of view.

But while the peaceful propagandists acknowledged the possibility of a discrepancy between the "interests" of the people and their "opinions," the rebels went further: they considered the ideals of the "working masses" in Russia to be "in essential agreement with modern socialism." The "opinions" of the people were, they believed, in accord with their interests. The only issue was how best to organize the people, and they found such a means in agitation based on the pressing, concrete needs of the people, consciously recognized. Such a view could easily be reduced to absurdity. This is what was done. In their reluctance to impose their views on the people, some Narodniks resorted to the most reactionary terms. (Among the Russian revolutionaries there were at one time isolated individuals who were not averse to reconciling themselves with the "people's tsar" in the name of populism. But this belch of Slavophile nonsense, it seems, "has completely vanished in our ranks." P. Akselrod. Everything for the people and by means of the people. Letter to the editor. Volnoe Slovo. No. 19.) In legal literature, this trend was reflected in its various phases in the articles of P.Ch. and Yuzov. The latter, in particular, often reduced the fundamental tendency of the old Narodnik movement to absurdity. And such an opponent was not difficult to cope with. One had only to find fault with some curiosity, which abounded in the articles of the author

of "The Foundations of Narodnikism," and victory was won, and the accursed question of reconciling the "opinions" of the people with their "interests" remained unanswered again.

The eighties put him back on the waiting list.

The bitter experience of acting for the people, but not through the people, which ended so tragically, revived the old folk traditions. Their spokesman was Yakovenko in his "Open Letter to Mr. Mikhailovsky" S.V. 1986. This letter and Mikhailovsky's reply best explain to us the dispute over "opinions" and interests.

"If you really want to serve someone or pay someone," says Yakovenko, "then you must act in accordance with the interests of these people, recognized and expressed by them themselves, that is, in accordance with their opinions, and not substitute your own understanding for them." Everything for the people and through the people! But what to do if the "opinions" of these people do not coincide with my "opinions" about their "interests"? And how many such cases there are! Should I start the same Sisyphean labor again? Continue to work for these people without meeting any response or sympathy from them? And

He turns to the teacher with longing.

To the damned questions we have been given direct answers!

And the teacher? The teacher answers him with a long discourse on "hating love." "If Ivan loves Fedora, who is great, but loves with a hateful love, because she is a fool, then undoubtedly his position is painful, he is a hero of torment. (disrespectful tone towards Fyodora is especially often encountered in Gleb Uspensky. It is encountered even more often in typical Narodnaya Volya members of the "first draft." This phenomenon is explained by a natural reaction against the preceding idealizations. At that time, our legal Narodniks raised the same outcry in response to these disrespectful comments (e.g., the article "What Gleb Uspensky Concluded") as they now raise in response to any, sometimes unfounded, attack by some "Marxist" against the peasantry.)

noise drama; but to jump out of this drama one catch-who jumps he can not, close his eyes to his position not dolzhen, and it is necessary to him to understand, in what greatness and

in what stupidity Ѳedory, and then direct all their efforts to strengthen the stupidity and strengthen the stupidity greatness. Here, but only here, and the end of the drama.

Well, what if this Fedora stubbornly remains a fool, and what if she stubbornly drives away her ardent admirers and, from time to time, stuns them with a hefty blow, or even sends them to the deanery office? But this will not disturb her faithful admirers. For her happiness, they are ready to renounce all their most vital and precious interests, even sacrifice their lives, ready to shame, to commit a crime, whatever you like. But Fedora is still a fool and does not want to change her "minds." So should we not change our opinions for these beautiful ones? Never! No matter how much they love Fedora, they will never give up their "mind" for her sake, or descend to her level!

"One can voluntarily, and therefore under the condition of being considered a disgrace or a virtue, a sin or a merit, renounce one's interests for the sake of other, alien interests, but to renounce one's own will is impossible." And since there is very little hope of a change in Fedora's mindset, it remains only to admit that, in essence, the question of Fedora's "wills" is not so important. "I don't really know whether Yakovenko is using my real words when he says: 'You believe that we must act in the interests of the people, but whether this will be in accordance with their opinions or not is a secondary question.' Not that it's secondary, but, in fact,

in any case, the second one, yes, I suppose." Mikhailovsky is afraid to speak out decisively. To say so would mean agreeing with "All the same" (P. Tkachev), that the

with whom he had so sharply polemicized in the 1970s. It must be admitted that if his love for Fedora had found a response in her heart, then the work of transforming Fedora from a fool into a clever girl would have proceeded faster and been more successful. But the conviction that it was possible to reconcile Fedora's opinion with her interests, which had never left Mikhailovsky in the 1970s, gave way to disappointment. If Fedora does not understand her happiness, let us make her happy against her will. Whether she wants it or not is a secondary question.

Poor Fedora! Centuries passed, everything strived for happiness, everything in the world changed several times over, but Fedora, who, though great, was still a fool, with eyes expressing infinite humility, meekly endured all kinds of torments, submissively allowing all sorts of Moscow and St. Petersburg monsters to play tricks on her. The day of liberation had

finally arrived. Will Fedora really remain the same fool, and the only difference will be that before she was beaten and tortured, unable to cope with her emotions, and now she will be loved and cherished. Sensing the justice of this protest, Mikhailovsky hastened to respond to it. "No matter how far your ideal, your opinion, may be from the opinion of the people, for the practical realization of this ideal it is necessary to take into account the opinions of those interested. At the very least, it is necessary to take advantage of every opportunity when this is possible." In any case, "the opinions of those interested must be accepted, if not for execution, then for information."

We see that the "repentant nobleman" has spoken in a language that is remarkably reminiscent of the language of the most unrepentant nobleman. But, besides this, such an answer, of course, is only an empty excuse. And if these "mistakes" still remain far from our opinions, and if the opinions accepted for knowledge turn out to be of such a kind that you are born with the same "the movement of some instinctive fist into this very mass of people", Fedora too? But who are these Ivans who love Fedora, who will accept Fedora's opinion, "if not for fulfillment, then for information", who will arrange her happiness? These Ivans are "we", the "intelligentsia" at the top standing like a city on a mountain." (Gleb Uspensky.) We have safely returned to purified weaving. Here is an interesting pendant from the underground realm: "the exploited majority must be recognized as having one very significant shortcoming. Usually it is a passive element. Only for a short time does it become active. One can bitterly complain about this, but nevertheless such a thing is logically (!) necessary… As you see, a fatal dilemma opens before the majority: either die of hunger along with the predators or feed themselves and support the luxurious life of organized exploiters. If there were no way out of this dilemma, there would be reason to despair for the fate of humanity! Fortunately, there is a way out. How the minority developed a special organ of attack for itself and predation, the modern state—so the majority must develop for itself a special organ that protects its interests and is always ready to fight against domination and exploitation. This is the revolutionary minority (as opposed to the privileged and, therefore, reactionary minority)… And let us not be frightened by verbal "bogeymen": Jacobinism, dictatorship, encroachment on the free development of the people. More than anyone else, we are convinced that the people have the right to truly human development: moreover, on the whole, they strive for a more normal, more just system than the present one… The strength of the revolutionary minority lies precisely in the fact that it rests with both feet on the fundamental interests of the people, the majority of the exploited masses…

The majority eternally revolves in a vicious circle. While striving for more normal living conditions, it nevertheless cannot develop within itself a sufficient active protest against the current system. For the development of active protest, in general an active sense of social activity, already presupposes different conditions of life for the majority. It seems that the conclusion is clear: the revolutionary minority must, through its active protest and struggle, change the old conditions and adapt the new ones to the normal development of the majority." (K. Tarasov, "Bankruptcy of Bourgeois Science," Bulletin of the People's Will. I, pp. 86, 89, 90.)

It is not difficult to demonstrate the complete groundlessness of this reasoning. The fundamental tenet of the old populism—everything for the people and by the people—remains in full force. Let us give the floor to the populist. "Without denying the fact that our intelligentsia (i.e. the truly educated stratum of society) is democratic to a much greater extent than the bourgeois intelligentsia of the West, it does not, however, prevent us from paying attention to two circumstances: 1) the sincerely democratic intelligentsia still constitutes a minority in the overall composition of the educated part of our society, and 2) we encounter a similar phenomenon in the history of other countries, in the era of the struggle against absolutism… The intelligentsia, as an aggregate of people imbued exclusively with ideal aspirations, living completely outside of class antagonism, does not exist… the result of the struggle for political freedom to an enormous extent depend on what role falls to the lot of the working masses in this struggle… The slogan: "everything for the nation", even with the addition: "through the part of the nation interested in this matter", with all its external ideality, has so far proved to be an excellent tool in the hands of the privileged

classes or their leaders to entice the working masses to the task of raking in the heat with their own hands for the benefit of the former…. the stronger the participation of truly popular elements in the general composition of the facts reforming the system of the empire, the greater the chances of diverting the direction of the resultant of all these transformative efforts towards the interests of the "illiterate and downtrodden". (P. Axelrod. "Everything for the people and by means of the people." Free Word. No. 19.)

Who is right? Theoretically, the second was right, and his opponent didn't deny it either. Of course, work for the people and by the people should be our ideal. But what are we to do if the people remain silent? Fold our arms across our chests? A consistent populist, who valued above all else activity for the people by the people, would rather agree to political

inaction than to concentrate the revolutionary movement exclusively among the intelligentsia. (P. Axelrod. "Everything for the people and by means of the people." Free Word. No. 19.) But this was easier said than done.

Revolutionary thought anxiously sought a way out of this vicious circle; without the people, revolution will lead to nothing, and the people do not want this revolution. Their "interests" are on the side of the revolutionaries, but their "mission" was at odds with their own interests. The subjective logic of the people stubbornly refused to come into agreement with the objective conditions of their existence, which were apparently pushing them toward socialism.

The following questions inevitably arose: are there not insurmountable obstacles to such an agreement? Is there hope for a change in these objective conditions? Does this people represent something homogeneous? Are the conditions of its existence really so sharply different from the Western ones?

European? These are the questions that revolutionary thought tries to answer.

But reality offered too many facts that ran counter to old notions. The people turned out to be far from as homogeneous as the intelligentsia had imagined. Kulaks and usury turned out not to be an adventitious phenomenon, not brought in from outside as parasites; they grew out of the people's soil and fed on its sap. Commodity production took one position after another from the subsistence economy. The community was disintegrating; not only did it fail to live up to the hopes placed in it, but in many places it itself became a tool for the exploitation of the poor community members by the rich. Beneath this vestige of antiquity lay a thoroughly individualistic economic organization, isolating one household from another to no less a degree than one community was isolated from another. The artel, upon closer examination, also proved far more suitable for the exploitation of some members by others than for the cooperative management of the economy. "Individuality" also proved a poor defense in the struggle against the factory. It had to be admitted that capitalism had made enormous strides.

Nikolai Nikon's famous article, despite its inaccurate explanation of the genesis of Russian capitalism, clearly demonstrated that "the capitalist current is clearly overpowering." From the picture of the post-reform economy drawn by Nikolai Nikon, the conclusion drawn by Mikhailovsky inevitably followed: "Having awaited the national resolution of the national

task," we, one might say, immediately opened wide our gates to a banking and railway Europe. This Europe, invading us without any protest on our part, quickly and tenaciously strangles the beginnings of our original or, perhaps, if you prefer, national economic development. Our unfinished building not only does not interfere with this invasion, but,

On the contrary, to promote it, willingly or unwillingly, by providing state funds for the exaggerated development of private interests and placing the welfare of the people and the "national" principle at their feet. And we, meanwhile, all remember with pride that we have lived to see a national solution to national problems! Moreover, citing this, so to speak, moth-eaten example, we recommend expectation as a political principle, a program! And fifteen years ago, these would perhaps have been reasonable speeches. Now they are too late. While applauding the triumphant entry of banking and railway Europe, it is ridiculous… ridiculous as you wish, to lock the doors to political and scientific Europe… for, even recognizing the various prides of Messrs. Aksakov and others as legitimate in principle, Europe can address us with the words of the Book of the Prophet Isain: "And you have become as weak as we! And you have become like us! Your pride is cast into the pit with all your noise; worms are spread beneath you, and worms are your covering!"

Yes! Russia was becoming like Europe! It was moving further and further away from the path by which it could have bypassed the thorny path of Western Europe. This awareness seemed to increase the energy of the revolutionary intelligentsia tenfold. And so, having gathered all its strength, "replacing the lack of material strength and the small number of fighters with dynamite and their endless self-sacrifice," it threw itself into a final mortal battle with depotism, in order to create more favorable conditions for its great task: freeing Russia from the clutches of capitalism. Despotism had been dealt a terrible blow. For a while it seemed that he had won, that he was going to give in, but, having become convinced that no one followed the handful of heroes, despotism recovered and, having unfurled the banner of "people's policy," giving complete freedom to the predatory instincts of various exploiters, he crushed the "People's Will" (The future historian of Russia will have to note that a whole series of concessions and "reforms" of the era of the "dictatorship of the heart" and "people's policy" were made under the stick of the "People's Will". When it was defeated, despotism ceased to be shy: only then did reaction begin to celebrate its orgies). The flower of an entire generation was mercilessly mown down.

They were dealt a bad hand: Few returned from the field!

"An idea divorced from the masses" proved powerless; the people continued to remain deaf to the appeals of those who remained faithful to the old banner. The majority was overcome by despondency and disappointment; only a small group rushed to "search" for "a point of support for the struggle" and tried to understand the reasons for their defeat.

We have become like Europe, but have we become weaker because of this? Is our "weakness" not the source of a new fervor? What does European reality tell us? And inquisitive revolutionary thought turns to the West.

V.

And then, by the beginning of the 1880s, great changes had taken place. The revolutionary movement, which had seemed to have died down after the dissolution of the International, was once again reviving. German social democracy, after some hesitation and mistakes of the 1870s, again adopted a revolutionary program at the Vidensk Congress of 1880, and in the elections of 1881 demonstrated what an irresistible force the proletariat, imbued with class consciousness, represents. The French proletariat, completely weakened after the bloodshed, lIn 1871, and in 1876, he rejected socialist theory at the Paris Congress and joined the Marxist program in the person of his most conscious elements. In England, which, according to the whole cathedral of the socialists, was always insured against the socialist plague, a social democratic federation was formed, setting itself the task of organizing the working class into a special body. political party. The same time applies to the formation of social democratic organizations in other countries. The seeds, planted by the "doctrinaires" of the International, have sprouted strongly. Everywhere the proletariat begins to gather under the banner of social democracy and becomes the main stronghold of all progressive aspirations.

Why, then, have the ideas of socialism, so poorly received on Russian soil, taken such firm root in the West? Why is the European proletariat more capable of accepting these ideas than the Russian people, imbued with communal instincts?

The answer to this question was provided by scientific socialism. A closer acquaintance with the "unread chapter of a favorite book," i.e., the philosophical and historical part of the teachings of Marx and Engels, showed that the very questions that arose for Russia in the eighties were already being posed in Germany in the forties. And in Germany, the "intelligentsia," having developed the ideal of a harmoniously developed personality, came

to the conclusion that it is realizable only in a soc9oialist society. And in Germany, the intelligentsia turned to the huts to direct them against the palaces, but the huts did not respond to the passionate appeal of the Büchners and Weidigs. And the German intelligentsia had to ask itself the same question: why is the people's "mission" do not fit well with his "interests"? And while the democrats were erupting With heated philippics addressed to poor Michel, then they turned to "society," the young Marx put the question differently: are there not in this oppressed people elements that, by the very conditions of their existence, would push in the same direction as the "intelligentsia," that would infuse blood, give life, "heart," to that movement, the head of which would be the highest product of German life, "philosophy"? And, having analyzed the objective conditions of existence of different social classes, Marx came to the conclusion that this "heart" must be the proletarian. Let's follow his argumentation: we will find a lot of familiar things in it.

"We," "standing on high, like a city upon a hill," have subjected everything heavenly and earthly to the most merciless criticism. By our criticism of religion, we have freed people from illusory happiness and thereby forced them to seek happiness in this world. We have understood that earthly ideals, like religion and language, are as much products of man himself. Instead of worshiping various idols created by himself, man should place the practical man above all else. To achieve this, it is necessary to abolish the social conditions that make man a humiliated, enslaved, degraded, despised being, and to create in their place new conditions under which man himself would become the highest being for man. Only the socialist system satisfies this requirement.

But the "idea" in itself is powerless. It is vital only when it is the "idea" of a class, when it is its conscious vision or representation, when it is already potently contained in the material conditions of existence of a given class philosophy. Consequently, ours can pass into reality only by relying on a class that would represent the complete end of class. Consequently, of everything human and could, therefore, win a place for itself in life only by fully acquiring all human rights. The very conditions of existence of this class necessarily change its "movements" in the same direction in which our philosophy pushes it. By protesting against the conditions of its existence, this class protests against the social conditions that dehumanize man. It cannot free itself without destroying its own conditions of existence. He cannot destroy them without at the same time destroying all the inhuman conditions of life that fall upon him with all their weight.

The point is not at all what this or that proletarian, and sometimes even the entire proletarian, "thinks." The point is what the proletarian is and what he is historically compelled to do in accordance with this being. His "opinions" can only temporarily clash with his "interests." He has no possibility of separating "theory" from "practice" and finding peace in the realm of "pure contemplation" or fatalistic indifference. Imperative need—an expression of historical necessity—serves as a "categorical imperative" for him, pushing him to struggle for his liberation, and pushing him all the more strongly because it is not a need caused by natural conditions. On the contrary, it is an artificially induced need, accompanying given social conditions. The idea of the denial of private property, socialism, finds firm support in the interests of the proletariat. And what class will be more attentive to this idea than the class whose principle of existence is the denial of this private property? The "idea" thus gains the sympathy of the masses, the "opinion" of the masses is on its side, and, having mastered the masses, the "idea" itself becomes a material force. Any attempt to isolate it from the masses, no matter how this attempt is explained,

children to her shame. It is impossible, therefore, to protest energetically enough against such attempts.

The disgrace of "idea" does not prove the indifference of the masses in general; it only proves that the given "idea" was not an expression of the "interests" of the masses, and if it was, then to a very insufficient degree. Not reaching the "heart" of the masses, it could not arouse enthusiasm, and without it great historical events are impossible.

The "intelligentsia," having found no sympathy among the masses, was inclined to regard their opinions as of secondary importance, to treat the masses as a superior to an inferior. It forgot that "movements" are conditioned by circumstances, determined by the social position of a given mass. If the "movements" of the masses did not change, this only meant that the new "idea" could not find any footing in the conditions of life of this mass: it was not the masses that were to blame, but the "intelligentsia," who had turned to the wrong address. Therefore, all the philippics against the masses testify to the folly of the "intelligentsia." It was necessary to address our "idea" to people whose entire life situation shapes their "opinions" in the direction of a given "idea." Conclusion: in order to realize the "philosophy" dear to us, we must address our sermon to the proletariat. Only they are interested in the implementation of our "idea," since it can be realized only when the conditions that give rise to wealth, the bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and poverty, the proletariat, on the other, disappear, when, consequently, private property is abolished.

Therefore, whoever values the "idea" must, in his practical and theoretical activity, choose as a criterion the interests of the proletariat, as the only class whose "opinions" are changed in a direction desirable for us by the very conditions of its existence.

Having already developed this "point of view", the correctness - (which was soon confirmed by German reality itself, (A few months after the publication of the "Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher," in which Marx first developed his point of view, the Silozian weavers' revolt broke out. It clearly demonstrated that only the proletariat possesses that revolutionary courage which throws down to its adversary the bold challenge: "I am nothing and I want to be everything) Marx came to the conclusion that the key to explaining reality (state forms and legal relations) must be sought in the material conditions of life. Further research led him to the conclusion that in any given historical epoch, the economic structure of society constitutes the basis of its political and intellectual history. It turned out that not only is the modern era characterized by class struggle, but that all history (written) has been the history of class struggle. It further emerged that the capitalist process of production itself creates all the material and intellectual elements of the future system, and that the very formulation of such a task was possible only because the material conditions for its solution were already present. Only now has the class struggle reached the stage at which the exploited and oppressed class (the proletariat) cannot free itself from the class that exploits and oppresses it (the bourgeoisie) without at the same time liberating the whole of society forever from exploitation, oppression, and class struggle.

It thus became clear that the proletarian not only must do this, but can do it. A more careful analysis of economic conditions showed, moreover, that the proletariat differs from other oppressed and exploited classes not by the degree of exploitation, but, to an incomparably greater extent, by its form. Under commodity production, and therefore under capitalism, that is, under such a form of commodity production in which on the market

There is a specific commodity—human labor power—only the proletarian struggles against the very foundations of exploitation, because commodity production hits no one as hard as the proletarian. After all, he is forced to live by selling himself, his labor power, while other oppressed classes—the petty bourgeoisie in all its forms, the peasantry, the artisans—have nothing against commodity production itself and, as classes, would only like to eliminate the conditions that place their goods at a disadvantage in the sphere of competition.

What is important, therefore, is not only the fact of enslavement—other classes are enslaved—but its form is incomparably more important, because with the change of this form, the opinions that arise and can arise in the minds of the enslaved also change. While the "opinions" of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry make them unconscious (at best) allies of the ruling classes, private property seems to be a pretext for their interests, and for both of them it is the second plus ultra of human freedom and individual independence - the "opinions" of the proletariat, as a class, in the historical process of development increasingly come into agreement with its "interests". Therefore, "of all the classes that now oppose the bourgeoisie, only the proletariat is a truly revolutionary class. All other classes decline and are destroyed with the development of large-scale industry: the proletariat will be created precisely by it." "The movement of the proletariat, therefore,

is (and is becoming more and more) a movement of the vast majority in the interests of the vast majority."

But it is not only its quantitative growth that is important. Mass movements have existed before. Its "qualitative" growth is much more important. While with the diversificationThere is a specific commodity—human labor power—only the proletarian struggles against the very foundations of exploitation, because commodity production hits no one as hard as the proletarian. After all, he is forced to live by selling himself, his labor power, while other oppressed classes—the petty bourgeoisie in all its forms, the peasantry, the artisans—have nothing against commodity production itself and, as classes, would only like to eliminate the conditions that place their goods at a disadvantage in the sphere of competition.

What is important, therefore, is not only the fact of enslavement—other classes are enslaved—but its form is incomparably more important, because with the change of this form, the opinions that arise and can arise in the minds of the enslaved also change. While the "opinions" of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry make them unconscious (at best) allies of the ruling classes, private property seems to be a pretext for their interests, and for both of them it is the second plus ultra of human freedom and individual independence - the "opinions" of the proletariat, as a class, in the historical process of development increasingly come into agreement with its "interests". Therefore, "of all the classes that now oppose the bourgeoisie, only the proletariat is a truly revolutionary class. All other classes decline and are destroyed with the development of large-scale industry: the proletariat will be created precisely by it." "The movement of the proletariat, therefore,

is (and is becoming more and more) a movement of the vast majority in the interests of the vast majority."

But it is not only its quantitative growth that is important. Mass movements have existed before. Its "qualitative" growth is much more important. While with the diversification With the rise of capitalism, the importance of other working classes declines with each passing year; the proletariat, on the contrary, becomes an increasingly important factor in the social organization of production. While the energy of resistance of other oppressed classes is dispersed across countless points of the "social organism," the energy of the proletariat is concentrated in a few, most sensitive, points. Here he throws off all his "peculiarities" – professional, religious, national, etc. – and turns into one great, united and cohesive army of fighters for a better future.

The "fulcrum" of the populists, "the people", with the development of economic relations, is split into parts with different interests (the homogeneous is transformed into the heterogeneous), the proletariat, on the contrary, entering this process, as a result of the different conditions of its genesis, is disunited, with the development of those same economic relations, is transformed into a single whole with homogeneous interests (the heterogeneous is transformed into the homogeneous). Of course, other exploited classes also have revolutionary significance, but they have it only insofar as they are about to join the ranks of the proletariat, insofar as they defend their present but future interests, insofar as they abandon their own point of view (i.e., they renounce the "opinions" generated in their heads by their present "interests") and adopt the point of view of the proletariat. The class ideology of the proletariat (its "opinions"), thus, increasingly becomes the ideology of all the "burdened and needy." and at the head of the great liberation movement of humanity there is no longer a small group of ideologists, critically thinking individuals, but a powerful proletarian, imbued with the consciousness of his historical missionWith the rise of capitalism, the importance of other working classes declines with each passing year; the proletariat, on the contrary, becomes an increasingly important factor in the social organization of production. While the energy of resistance of other oppressed classes is dispersed across countless points of the "social organism," the energy of the proletariat is concentrated in a few, most sensitive, points. Here he throws off all his "peculiarities" – professional, religious, national, etc. – and turns into one great, united and cohesive army of fighters for a better future.

The "fulcrum" of the populists, "the people", with the development of economic relations, is split into parts with different interests (the homogeneous is transformed into the heterogeneous), the proletariat, on the contrary, entering this process, as a result of the different conditions of its genesis, is disunited, with the development of those same economic relations, is transformed into a single whole with homogeneous interests (the heterogeneous is transformed into the homogeneous). Of course, other exploited classes also have revolutionary significance, but they have it only insofar as they are about to join the ranks of the proletariat, insofar as they defend their present but future interests, insofar as they abandon their own point of view (i.e., they renounce the "opinions" generated in their heads by their present "interests") and adopt the point of view of the proletariat. The class ideology of the proletariat (its "opinions"), thus, increasingly becomes the ideology of all the "burdened and needy." and at the head of the great liberation movement of humanity there is no longer a small group of ideologists, critically thinking individuals, but a powerful proletarian, imbued with the consciousness of his historical mission.

So what? Does the "intelligentsia" lose from this? Does its task become less idealistic? It "gains" in all respects. "Intellectuals," "ideologists who have risen to the theoretical understanding of the entire course of historical development," are no longer in danger of remaining misunderstood and being crushed by the ruling classes. The overwhelming task of "standing guard over the interests of the people, protecting them" is removed from it, a task that is even more dangerous because it develops in the intelligentsia a tendency to separate itself from the masses, to place itself above them, to regard them as material. "It is hard to be alone." Join the ranks of the proletariat fighting for its liberation, help, you rich in knowledge and science, "to make up to some extent for the lack of historical experience," and you will see what a terrible, irresistible force knowledge and science become when they enter into an alliance with the proletariat. II If the words "comprehensive development of the personality" are not just a phrase on your lips, if this is not "irritation in the captivity of thought", then you will understand that only this activity can accelerate the onset of a social system in which the free development of each person will become a condition for the free development of all!

Guided in your actions by this criterion—the interests of the proletariat, not only as it is, but also as it develops—you will not risk becoming confused, you will not be in danger of falling under the power of the pompous phrases with which democracy has lulled itself for so long. Leave it to others to work in the name of progress, truth, justice, goodness, and

beauty! Too often, all these Schlagworte, as the Germans say, have served as a cover for the egotistical aspirations of individual classes.

But why not choose the interests of labor, of the working classes, as the criterion? Simply because labor is a concept that has no definite historical or sociological meaning, and no one coordinates it.

A certain system of social relations is as much a biological as a sociological term. The peasant works, the artisan works, the wage-earner works—by abstracting from the form in which their labor is manifested, we thereby abstract from those specific social relations under which and in which labor is performed. This is a common error of idealism, an error into which vulgar materialism also falls: it is so absorbed in the essence of things that it does not notice or passes by the forms in which this essence is manifested. It doomed idealism to impotence in the field of natural science, and it also dooms it to impotence in the field of history and sociology.

"All history is a long martyrology of the working classes, at the basis of which lies violence and enslavement." But how far will we go if we forget that this violence, during the historical process, has taken various forms: some forms perpetuate this violence and turn human society into a hive or anthill, others evoke and nourish protest against the rapists and enslavers. These forms are no less diverse today, and if we forget their specific differences, we will not understand the specific differences of the worldviews that are formed on the basis of various forms of violence. We risk not seeing the trees for the forest.

Before you is a master and his journeyman, a peasant and his farmhand - can you look at them as something homogeneous? The master wants to lengthen the working day and reduce wages, the journeyman - the opposite. But you want, perhaps, to expel from the "laboring classes" the masters who have journeymen and the peasants who hire farmhands? You will leave only the individual peasant artisans who manage without hired labor. Very well. But you and I know very well - that's why we and the socialists—that the cause of all their misfortunes lies in commodity production, that is, ultimately, in private ownership of the instruments of production. Is it in their class interest to abolish this private property? Look at all these nationalist, anti-Semitic, and clerical parties—and you will see with what difficulty the artisans, peasants, and the petty bourgeoisie in general give up the hope of improving their situation by preserving and strengthening their private property, what a high degree of development they must achieve in order to pass to the point of view of the

proletariat. (A consistent populist only needed to be convinced that the petty bourgeoisie could turn to socialism only by renouncing its class point of view, being subjected to the strong influence of the proletariat's point of view, so that he would become a social democrat. See Axelrod's article "Socialism and the Petty Bourgeoisie" by V. M. V., books 1 and 2.) Try to evaluate such a phenomenon as credit from the point of view of the interests of the working classes, and you will see how, with all your reluctance, you cannot help but adopt a petty-bourgeois point of view.

We agree with you that in a society divided into classes we must abandon all hopes of an "objective" investigation, that each of us must openly declare: "these are the kind of people with whom I sympathize, into whose situation I mentally place myself," but we see this "kind of people" in the working class, in the proletariat.

"Subjective disagreements, - says N. Mikhailovsky, - are not eliminated by the communication of knowledge, because they are generated not by the difference in the quantity of knowledge, but by the difference in sympathies and antipathies, the difference in social positions that prevent people from representing other people's thoughts and feelings in form "own." ("The communication of information" is, of course, not omnipotent: it must be assisted by a change in social conditions, but the mere possibility of the unimpeded "communication of information" already represents a very large step towards a society in which "subjective disagreements" generated by the difference in social situations will disappear. Meanwhile, one of the main obstacles to achieving this possibility is the passivity of the same "people".) This "social position" of the proletariat generates in it sympathies and antipathies identical with those of the "ploughmen", "its feelings and thoughts" become "ours". While the "voice" of the village, the people (the working classes), loses its primitive harmony, being replaced by a desperate discord, in which the grunting of the "triumphant pig" is heard ever more clearly, the "voice" of the proletariat becomes ever more harmonious and increasingly merges in unison with the voice of the "intelligentsia".

And the more resolutely we are guided in our activities by the interests of only this class, the sooner conditions will be created under which it will be possible to eliminate "subjective differences" among the "working classes."

We now have an extraordinary number of people who love to talk about "high honesty," that is, about morality. From them we learn that Marx and Engels said a new word only in the socio-economic sphere, that "in his philosophical and idealistic spirit Lassalle stands

above Marx, it is to him (?) that belongs the idealistic interpretation of the "idea of the fourth estate," it is he (?) who with extraordinary force showed the universal character of the idea and invested it with "valuable moral content."(N. Berdyaev, The Struggle for Idealism. World of God, June 1901.) There is no point in refuting this chronological and logical absurdity. We will only ask people, so There are many who speak of the absence of moral content in Marx's system: if the struggle for the realization of one's ideal, if the desire to connect into one inseparable whole "theory" with "practice", "ideals" with "reality", with the risk of "laying down one's life for one's friends" is not moral, then what is legal for them, what is capable of satisfying their sense of law? Isn't this the bourgeois morality whose highest ideal is the possibility of giving with the right hand without the left knowing it, a morality that sees nothing unjust in the very fact of the existence of people who give and receive, people who have the opportunity to give only because everything is taken away from others?

But the ideal of the "materialist" proletariat is "satiety," "material security"! Oh, how the poor are so parfaits! And the very people who, on another page, recognize the "materialist understanding of history" have resorted to such arch-bourgeois banalities. Abandon the world of well-fed people, and therefore not thinking about satiety. Go into the world of dispossessed workers, and you will see what a high morality is developing in the basements and corners into which the preaching of its ideal has penetrated! This morality fundamentally denies all old systems of morality. Even the best of them saw nothing immoral in the division of society into classes and only tried to soften its consequences. But the proletariat, from the conditions of its existence, creates a new morality that excludes the possibility of viewing a person as a means.

The working class cannot but protest against the inherited, traditional morality. Only in the struggle for its liberation can it create the conditions under which man will cease to be a means. And what could be more moral than activity directed

noy to expose the very basis of all immorality, the domination of one person over another?

But we have digressed. These questions were not the point of disagreement between us and the "seven dessiatinki." They, too, were familiar with the idea that socialism sets itself the ideal of "satiety." They, like us, knew that these speeches were "ringing brass and clanging cymbals."

They, "die Brust vol Welimut, das Haupt vol Zweifel," wanted to know the "riddle of life," to know the world as it is. Some quickly resolved all these questions, having adopted the worldview of the German materialists of the fifties. Others, not satisfied with this solution, turned to positivism, and then to scientific philosophy. (In this regard, the controversy about the "use of philosophy" between P. Nikitin (Tkachev) on the one hand and V. V. Lesevich on the other is of great interest.) We, too, have been fascinated by it since, but the fascination with it in the seventies had completely different socio-psychological roots: having decided that man, by the very nature of his organization, is incapable of explaining the "riddles of life," having acknowledged that in this world he can be satisfied with the truth for man, the man of seventy—for better or worse—having clarified the issues of the reality surrounding him, threw himself into revolutionary activity. Enough knowledge has been accumulated; it's time to pass it on to the masses! When the political struggle came to the fore, Dühring began to enjoy particular sympathy, but even in him the "epistemological" side of his philosophy was of little interest to the revolutionary of the seventies: most of all they valued the "active" character of his ethics and the promotion to the forefront "political factor." What does the old truth tell us?

The mental process takes place within the limits of an individual, a 'personality', or in other words, 'all mental, all psychological processes take place in the personality and only in it; only it feels, thinks, suffers and enjoys'. (In repeating this position, Mr. Mikhailovsky did not know that he, like Engels, was putting forward theses that were understandable only as a denial of Hegel's theses. The words "only" protest against Hegel's hypostatization of one of the functions of the human personality - thought - in the form of the absolute idea. It would not be difficult to prove that Hegel, negatively or positively, had a great influence on Mr Mikhailovsk's worldview.) This position is generally true, but it requires significant additions. Indeed, it is the individual who "thinks." But are the thoughts with which he operates his thoughts? No. He is a social product, for our personality, our individual person, belongs to a certain form of society. But this social form itself is not something unchangeable. It is a product of history. True, man himself makes this history - with his mind, his will, but he makes it in ready-made conditions that were formed long before his appearance on God's vine; he makes it with his mind, but with a "mind" all the constituent elements of which are a modified reflection of the conditions surrounding him in his brain, received by him in a ready-made form from a whole series of ancestors; he makes it with his will, but with a will, every movement of which is motivated, caused by the world around him, indirectly or directly. By changing the "ready-made" conditions, he himself changes: his nervous organization becomes more complex, his "mind" is enriched, his "will"

becomes more meaningful and diverse, his "horizon" expands, etc., etc. In a word, along with all his abilities, his cognitive ability also develops.

This capacity is inherently historical. To place limits on it, therefore, would be to place limits on historical development in general. Of course, no one can escape the conditions of their existence. In our cognitive capacity, we are limited by the means that a given form of social organization places at our disposal. This circumstance sets certain limits to our cognitive capacity, but these limits are being pushed back with the development of societies with different relationships. What was inaccessible to the human mind yesterday becomes accessible to it tomorrow. The limitations of human thought in each individual era are eliminated by the boundlessness of historical development. That is why we reject any attempt to draw a line between the knowable and the unknowable, to divide the world into the world of numena, entities, and the world of phenomena, volleniya: for us there is only the line between already known and not yet known reality.

The answer to our questions can only be given by the development of this reality, in other words, practical human activity. After all, the only criterion for the truth of our thinking is

its adequacy to the given reality, to the given relations of things among themselves, is determined. That is why the question of whether human thinking is capable of cognizing objects in the form in which they exist in reality is not a theoretical question at all, but a practical one. Man must prove the truth of his thought through practice, i.e., prove that it has real power and does not stop at this side of phenomena. The dispute about the reality or unreality of thinking, isolating itself from practice "is a purely scholastic question" (Marx). Only after receiving the baptism of experience and practice, your hypothesis, i.e., a thought that has not yet prove adequacy to the actual relations of things, can be transformed into a scientific theory. (Newton's theory of universal movement and Jean Leverrier's discovery of Neptune, Maxwell's electromagnetic theory of light and Hertz's experiments, Darwin's theory of the origin of species and later observations of the change of species under the influence of various factors, Mendeleyev's (Lothar Meyer's) periodic table of elements and the discoveries of Lecoq d'Orsay and Nielsen. Of course, these theories, in turn, could only arise after humanity had accumulated a certain amount of experience. Here the decisive significance belongs to "industry", practice, technology. We must not forget that "all products of thought can be developed with certain advances in technology and with certain products of creativity of social forms." P. Lavrov, "Experience of the history of thought of modern times," p. 68.11).

The more diverse human practice becomes, the more, under the influence of the development of the mechanical and chemical industries, it studies and reconstructs the process of formation of various substances, the more the genesis of everything that exists is clarified, the further the boundaries of tannin are pushed back. Thus, "everything mysterious, everything that leads theory to mysticism, finds a rational solution in human practice and in the understanding of this practice."

The greatest step in this direction will be the elucidation of social relations; the veil of mystery must be torn from them, they must be transformed into the conscious product of people who have penetrated the secret of their social relations. If even now civilized humanity, despite the class struggle tearing it apart, despite the relatively insignificant number of people taking a conscious part in historical life, has wrested so many secrets from nature, then how many times will its cognitive powers increase if nature is confronted by humanity united in one great family, directing all its forces to the struggle with her? Until humanity has developed all its capabilities, it would be vulgar philistinism on our part to sign humanity's testimonium paupertatis and say: Ignorabimus!

But you want not only to prove your truth, you want to make it the property of all people, you want to "embody truth in social forms." And here theory must go hand in hand with practice. Knowing full well that people are a product of circumstances, you and I, of course, will not forget that circumstances are changed by people, and this is often done by vulgar materialism: history is made itself - and again we will all turn to the same practice: changing the world of concrete phenomena, through our concrete practical activity, will give a vital impetus to the theoretical assimilation of our truths. Without being supplemented by practice, theory remains in the realm of "pure contemplation." "Philosophers have only explained the world one way or another: but the point is to change it" (Marx).

You direct your weapon of criticism against the given social relations; you have exposed the contradictions hidden within them with the knife of your analysis, but this is not enough: "the weapon of criticism cannot replace the weapon of criticism," you must, therefore, revolutionize these social conditions by eliminating their contradictions. Being revolutionaries in the realm of theory, you cannot but be revolutionaries in the realm of practice. Only revolutionary activity knows no separation of the truth of the theoretical heaven from the truth of the practical earth; only it is truly practical critical activity. Sociological theory complements Is carried out by the corresponding sociological practice.

But your theory, our opponents will tell us, is focused only on one side of this social-private life, she ignores all other aspects.

An old fable! Social life is extremely complex; it has, as you put it, an extraordinary number of "sides." But does this exclude the possibility for us of finding a central point within it from which we could, "from within," "illuminate" all aspects of this complex life? We, for our part, believe that this central point is the socio-economic structure of society. But we want not only to "understand" this social order; we want to change it. And in the proletariat we have found the force capable of doing this. The proletariat is the lever with which "philosophy" will turn the entire world of social relations upside down!

The "hypothesis" of the young Marx is increasingly confirmed by "practice." It gave him unprecedented powers of foresight, it served as a guiding thread in his theoretical research, it helped him confidently understand the complex phenomena of the present, it enabled him to link into a single inseparable whole the truth of the theoretical heaven and the truth of the practical earth. Truth-truth and truth-justice, so long at odds with each other, were united in his theory into one great, twofold truth.

WE.

A new "point of view" was found. It fully satisfied the condition set by us: it did not sacrifice the truth of theoretical philosophy for the sake of the truth of practical life, and vice versa.

But no matter how good a new idea may be, its more or less widespread adoption requires appropriate conditions. True, Western European experience increasingly proved the correctness of Marx's point of view. The 1980s for Western Europe were years of unstoppable development of social democrats. Con-private life, she ignores all other aspects.

An old fable! Social life is extremely complex; it has, as you put it, an extraordinary number of "sides." But does this exclude the possibility for us of finding a central point within it from which we could, "from within," "illuminate" all aspects of this complex life? We, for our part, believe that this central point is the socio-economic structure of society. But we want not only to "understand" this social order; we want to change it. And in the proletariat we have found the force capable of doing this. The proletariat is the lever with which "philosophy" will turn the entire world of social relations upside down!

The "hypothesis" of the young Marx is increasingly confirmed by "practice." It gave him unprecedented powers of foresight, it served as a guiding thread in his theoretical research, it helped him confidently understand the complex phenomena of the present, it enabled him to link into a single inseparable whole the truth of the theoretical heaven and the truth of the practical earth. Truth-truth and truth-justice, so long at odds with each other, were united in his theory into one great, twofold truth.

VI.

A new "point of view" was found. It fully satisfied the condition set by us: it did not sacrifice the truth of theoretical philosophy for the sake of the truth of practical life, and vice versa.

But no matter how good a new idea may be, its more or less widespread adoption requires appropriate conditions. True, Western European experience increasingly proved the correctness of Marx's point of view. The 1980s for Western Europe were years of unstoppable development of social democrats. 57

The growth between then and the seventies was striking to everyone. It found particularly vivid expression at the Paris International Congress of 1889. It seemed to review all the forces of socialism and sum up the eleven years of activity since 1878, when social democracy could be considered a serious force only in Germany, and even then it seemed to be on the brink of collapse. The results were brilliant. Socialism had taken firm root in all countries. Everywhere there were more or less significant parties. Only one country had to, through the mouth of one representative (I. Lavrov), state, after an outline of the history of the once so glorious revolutionary movement, the complete stagnation – and through the mouth of another (G. V. Plekhanov) express the hope that the Russian working class would again give Russia the opportunity to enter the ranks of the international socialist army.

This hope was justified. The Paris Congress also gave the proletariat of all countries, especially the "backward countries," a powerful means of spreading socialist ideas among the indifferent working masses. On February 20, 1890, German Social Democracy received approximately 1,424,000 votes in the elections. Against a proletariat imbued with class consciousness, all exceptional laws proved powerless. Bismarck, a man of iron and blood, the arbiter of Europe's destinies, the personification of brute force and despotism, had to go.

And on May 1st of that same year, all of Western Europe presented a strange spectacle. It seemed as if a terrible enemy stood at its gates, ready to destroy everything. The entire police force was on its feet. Troops were drawn to the cities. A gloomy silence reigned, as before a thunderstorm. And yet, the day was spring-like and peaceful. Western Europe was not threatened by any invasion. What had happened? Obedient to the decree of its representatives, the proletariat staged the most peaceful demonstration. What was it that so terrified the bourgeoisie?

58

"If the slaves had counted their numbers, we would have perished." But what the Roman optimates had only dreamed of in moments of satiety with life, the bourgeoisie now seemed terrifyingly obvious. The slaves of capital for the first time counted their numbers and felt that they were a force before which the shackles of capitalism could withstand as little as the chains with which the cold bound the life-giving forces of nature before the hot rays of the May sun. To become this force, the masses needed only a consciousness of their true interests. And the work of educating the working masses began to boil as never before.

It began in Russia. The elections of February 20, 1890, and the first May Day protests had an impact on Russia, compared to the influence of the International and the Communist Party. Social democracy was already an undisputed, universally recognized force. Scientific socialism, or Marxism, was soon to become fashionable.

Meanwhile, in Russia, conditions favorable to the assimilation of this doctrine were developing ever more rapidly and ever more powerfully. Practice came to the aid of theory. The Russian revolutionary movement, during the 1880s, was dying and, by the end of them, seemed to have completely died out. The old "People's Will" was dead. True, it "died" as Chartism had once "died" in England. It forced the government to carry out a whole series of "reforms" and pushed it onto the path of politics, the motto of which was: "Enrichissez vous" (enrich yourself). The party that wanted to free Russia from the hand of capitalism, from the bourgeois order, thus accelerated the process of transforming our state into a Western European, bourgeois one. Russia became increasingly Europeanized. But by doing so, the "People's Will" hastened its impending demise. By promoting the development of capitalism with all its might, the state thereby created and increased the class that would be its gravedigger, as well as the gravedigger of capitalism. Urban, commercial and industrial the

population grew to a gigantic size, and with it the village and the urban working class. The spontaneous, mass movement grew and spread.

Joining the old Narodnaya Volya workers' circles, resuming the old, temporarily interrupted mowing, the first adherents of social democracy carried the preaching of the ideas of scientific socialism to the working class. They had to overcome many prejudices and preconceptions at every step. The work was invisible, unnoticeable, and did not seem to yield any tangible results. But this was only an appearance. Those same epigones who so unfairly treated the article… "transcendental contempt" for the so-called "circle members," later, under more favorable conditions, they found active collaborators among the workers, propagated by the first pioneers of social democracy. And these conditions very soon came true.

The famine of 1891-92 dealt the final blow to all the populist prejudices that had revived during the reaction of the 1880s. The passivity of the peasantry was all too obvious. And the blow dealt by this famine was irreparable. The differentiation of the peasantry became even more pronounced. The remnants of the Narodnaya Volya, especially in Russia, became increasingly imbued with the new teaching. The ranks of its followers began to swell rapidly. Work among the working class accelerated and intensified. And it soon bore fruit.

The Petersburg strikes of 1896-97 demonstrated that the working class in Russia was the only force that could impress absolutism and force it to make concessions. And the events of February and March 1901, the significance of which cannot be overstated, demonstrated to all the doubters that the working class cherished not only the interests of the "knife and fork," but also the interests of freedom of science, education, and knowledge. The Russian working class turned out to be the only class that, in alliance with "us," to bear on our mighty shoulders the task of cleansing Russia from all filth. For decades, "we" have been standing on top, that the city

"on the mountain," we tried to put our ideals into practice. But life responded to us with cruel persecution, and the "working and burdened" stubbornly refused to respond to our call. The time has finally come when the "opposing and supportive hand" met the warm handshake of the muscular hand of millions of working people, when "we" felt behind us "the heavy tread of mighty labor battalions," and "we," in the name of old memories, old pre-conceptions, still cling to scraps of the old truth or try to hire a new suit for it. As if

everything that is dear to us in the old truth. did not enter entirely into the new one, as if the new truth is not an organic development of the old!

The old truth is dead! Long live the new truth!

--

Conclusion

And Mikhailovsky?

Baron von Greenwaldus, Famous in Germany, In took and fought On the stone in front of the castle, In front of the castle Amalie Sit, frowning

Year after year, the Barons fight, the Barons feast, Baron von Grünwaldus, still in the same position, sits on a stone…

While reading the articles of Mikhailovsky's last period of activity, I often recalled these verses, which he once cited to characterize the literary activity of Mr. Tsypin. And we can now say to him: "No, 15-20 years have not passed in vain; they have revealed many mistakes and enthusiasms, and have required further development, new applications of the same, however, fundamental idea, which animated literature during the period of revival… it would be too much to dwell even on the most vital aspects of old literature, leaving them without further development and clarification."

He did not go further than the point that Mr. Mikhailovsky reached in the early 1980s. Even then, he managed to vividly and powerfully reflect in literature

aspirations of those who recognized that "light is needed above all, and light is unconditional freedom of thought and speech, and unconditional freedom of thought and speech is impossible without personal inviolability, and personal inviolability requires guarantees." This was for him "the most urgent demand of our life; a demand so urgent that without its satisfaction all the good intentions of even the populists themselves must dissipate in the world of beautiful words and dreams." He already acknowledged that "the possibility of a direct transition to a better, higher order, bypassing the middle stage of its development, the stage of the bourgeois state… diminishes, one might say, with each

passing day. Practice cuts it mercilessly, accordingly, our program becomes more complex, remaining with the same final goal, but developing new means."

Mikhailovsky had never been an unconditional defender of our community, and now he even feels embarrassed for V.V. when this "completely conscientious, but narrow and one-sided worker" substitutes benevolent fantasies for harsh and unsightly reality. He knows that "the village is splitting into two layers, separating out rich kulaks who hold the rest of the village population under their brutal heel: that the latter is losing its "independent position in production." But he is not in a position to understand the full historical significance of a population deprived of its "independent position in production."

And skepticism creeps into the soul of the old fighter. He stops believing in the future, in a "better, higher order." He is irritated by this confidence in others, and he bursts out with the following tirade addressed to those who are confident: "Regarding the future, Marx (perhaps together with Engels) is credited with foreseeing or prophesying the outcome of the capitalist system. Whether it will come true or not is a matter ofaspirations of those who recognized that "light is needed above all, and light is unconditional freedom of thought and speech, and unconditional freedom of thought and speech is impossible without personal inviolability, and personal inviolability requires guarantees." This was for him "the most urgent demand of our life; a demand so urgent that without its satisfaction all the good intentions of even the populists themselves must dissipate in the world of beautiful words and dreams." He already acknowledged that "the possibility of a direct transition to a better, higher order, bypassing the middle stage of its development, the stage of the bourgeois state… diminishes, one might say, with each passing day. Practice cuts it mercilessly, accordingly, our program becomes more complex, remaining with the same final goal, but developing new means."

Mikhailovsky had never been an unconditional defender of our community, and now he even feels embarrassed for V.V. when this "completely conscientious, but narrow and one-sided worker" substitutes benevolent fantasies for harsh and unsightly reality. He knows that "the village is splitting into two layers, separating out rich kulaks who hold the rest of the village population under their brutal heel: that the latter is losing its "independent position in production." But he is not in a position to understand the full historical significance of a population deprived of its "independent position in production."

And skepticism creeps into the soul of the old fighter. He stops believing in the future, in a "better, higher order." He is irritated by this confidence in others, and he bursts out with the following tirade addressed to those who are confident: "Regarding the future, Marx (perhaps together with Engels) is credited with foreseeing or prophesying the outcome of the capitalist system. Whether it will come true or not is a matter of the future shows us, but since the history of mankind has never seen anything like this before, then in any case this prophecy cannot be based on the data of historical experience and historical science…

Historical reality has never yet given us such a completion of the capitalist system anywhere or at any time. This is an ideal that some consider feasible and wonderful, while others consider it unrealizable or not good at all. This is a matter of faith, which, according to a well-known and perfectly fair definition, is confidence in the invisible as if it were visible, and in the desired and expected as if it were present. Such is the common fate of all ideals, and I am not against them. Of course, because without them, life is incomplete, empty, and dark."

And this very writer who once wrote such beautiful lines about idols and ideals reached this purely philistine view of ideals. Let us recall his own words: "Idols are objects of worship, awe, and adoration, with the firm recognition of the impossibility of equaling them, of attaining their greatness and power. An ideal, on the contrary, is something practically obligatory for man: man desires and feels the possibility of attaining this or that state… The possibility of attaining a certain combination of things by one's own human means constitutes their necessary condition. A certain ideal may be unattainable by human consciousness either today or tomorrow; perhaps a whole series of generations must pave the way to it with their bones, but in any case it is close, akin to man: a person recognizes it as obligatory and possible for himself to go, to approach it." Thus, the "best, highest order" from the ideal of something close, akin to a person remained, however, "something beautiful, but pedopredativnym, alien, which one can only admire." "Of course, they are good things, and I am not against them, without them life is incomplete and dark." then the conclusion is not difficult to draw, and was made. "The snail will eat, someday." Instead of striving for the unattainable, for "the far-off," wouldn't it be better to look closely at "our neighbors." There is so much suffering and grief in the world! Will we forget all this for some distant future that may never come? And, left "without a road," the writer, having doubted even the goal to which two paths once led, now advises Natasha, like Solomin to Marianne, to engage in "love for one's neighbor."

We've been talking a lot lately about "inheritance" and those who renounce it. We think that if this issue were subjected to a more thorough review, it would turn out that it is the accusers themselves who renounce it, or even squander it, very often. Then it would also not be difficult to understand why, in the speeches of those who "renounce," one so often hears "the bitter mockery of a deceived son at a squandered father."

July–August 1901

Kritikie Programmy RSDLP

1906

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Preface to the second edition - III

Preface to the first edition - V

Part one. From the field of theory.

1) Historical background - 1

2) What should we demand from the program? - 9

3) What does excessive caution sometimes lead to? - 15

4) "In defiance" of the author of the "crappy little book" - 45

5) Development of the labor movement and its international character - 51

6) What are the characteristics of bourgeois society - 60

7) Women's and children's work, living work and the deterioration of the working class. -73

Part two. From the field of practice.

1) The tasks of social democracy in general - 83

2) Features of Russia and the task of the Russian social democrats - 100

a) Feature one. - Capitalism under the overt supervision of socialism -104

b) Peculiarity two. - The political infertility of our bourgeoisie - 114

c) Peculiarity three. - The gigantic growth of the labor movement within the framework of the autocratic system - 139

d) What can the experience of German social democracy teach us? Conclusions. - 148

Part three. Opportunism in the uniform of orthodoxy.

1) Comrade Lenin at a rendezvous with the Marshal of the Nobility. - 167

2) Foreign doctrinaires and Russian practitioners - 176

3) Puppet comedy with a bouquet of Marxist ideologists - 195

4) "Remnants" and "first fruits" - 209

5) Workers' democracy and bourgeois democracy - 222

6) Social Democracy and the Peasantry.

a) Social Democratic "peasant phobia" - 234

b) Program of enlightened agrarians or agrarian program? - 244

c) Excursion to the "segments" - 251

d) "Iskra" as an agronomist and a civil servant. The secret of the revolutionary baobab - 268

7) So what to do? -283

8) Afterword - 302

Preface to the second edition.

The book offered to readers is a reprint of the critical essay "The Draft Program of Iskra and the Tasks of Russian Social Democrats." Written in December-February 1902-1903 and published in March 1903, it was an analysis of the draft party program and commentary on it, placed in the fourth book of Zarya (articles by G. Plekhanov and N. Lenin). In passing, I also analyzed the tactical views of the old Iskra, which had become the symbol of faith of our "politicians" or "Iskra members."

As comrades know, this criticism served as a new home for the most bitter attacks on the author, which reached their climax at the Second Congress. Now that "Iskrism" is living out its last days, when many of its most staunch followers have long since changed their views, it will be received calmly even by those who saw it as an attack on Party unity. The "draft" program has become the official Party program, but it has not become any better for it.

I have only thrown out a few sharp remarks—my polemics were, in the broadest sense of the word, forced—and I have made some stylistic changes. Of course, my criticism is "outdated" in places. Criticism of life has already eliminated some of the shortcomings I pointed out then. There is much I would like to supplement, but I prefer to give my book for the "court" of the partners without any changes (Recently, the publication "Iskra" published a brochure by Parvus, "Where do we differ?" Lenin's reply to his article in Proletary. He finds that, among his materials, I gave "a very accurate criticism of the program." "It is a great pity that his kindness prevented him from expressing himself on this question earlier. There is no doubt that, with his characteristic literary grace and gentleness, his criticism would sooner have attracted the favor which, in his opinion, the book deserves, but which it could not win by its literary devices).

I hope that I will still be able to speak out regarding the relevant resolutions of both the "minority" conference and, in particular, the "majority" conference.

In my essay I have also retained an analysis of the theoretical part of the program. I continue to consider the formulation of the principles of scientific socialism adopted in it to

be extremely unsuccessful. My assumption that, in this part, it could please only Bernstein was fully justified. I am confident that, with the revival of interest in theoretical questions, a desire will also arise to quickly eliminate the theoretical shortcomings of the program I have pointed out.

Comrade Plekhanov's answer ("Orthodox Bukvoedstvo," Iskra, Nos. 41-43) is no longer convincing, since he has since been forced to radically change his views on both the theory and practice of the "Iskrists." The founder of Russian social democracy was sadly forced to acknowledge the fact that, during the period of "Iskristism" or "politicism," theory was even more hampered than during the period of "economism."

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

In the first issue of these Materials, devoted to an analysis of the new program of Rabochago Dilo, we dealt with a range of ideas condemned, in our deep conviction, to a slow death. Comrade Lenin, who as early as March 1902 launched a campaign against Rabochago Dilo and in June of that year declared that economism was already dead, can now see that my relative pessimism was closer to the truth.

To the question "What to do?" Comrade Lenin replies: "Liquidate the third period"(The speech is about the liquidation of the period of the so-called "economism"). But there are different liquidations of liquidations. First of all, a correct assessment of all the pluses and minuses of the "mass" being liquidated is needed. We, for our part, think that the point of view on which Comrade Lenin stands is Lenin does not allow us to accurately assess those "pluses" which alone can explain the "giant step forward" made, in his own words, by our movement from 1894 to 1901. During this period, those close ties were established between the working masses and social democracy which are no less dear to us, "dogmatists," than to "practitioners." Revolutionary social democracy, "orthodoxy," must give a clear and definite answer to the question: how can one work "for the workers' cause in close organic connection with the proletarian struggle?" (I retain the awkward formulation of Comrade Martynov), without putting the "mass workers' movement" at the forefront? The fate of the Deleonists in America and the Social Democratic Federation in England shows that this question is a fundamental issue for revolutionary social democrats, a question of life or death.

But perhaps Iskra's views and ours on this issue are completely identical? I think that is not to everyone. In our opinion, the leadership of the economic struggle of the proletariat must be taken into the hands of revolutionary social democracy, the same social democracy that makes only one "demand" to the modern political regime: to cease to exist. Only in this way will it be possible to "create a tradition that will never allow bourgeois democracy, no matter how revolutionary it may act, to drag the workers' movement in its tow" (See. Announcement of publications gr. "Struggle", p. 9.- VI), to expand and strengthen those connections that will enable us, during the revolution and the day after it, to be the real vanguard of the revolutionary class itself, and not just a staff without Armenians.

Liquidation of liquidations is not the same. We are not, after all, "starting over." We simply want the "minuses" of the previous period to disappear as quickly as possible. And we will achieve this only if we succeed in creating a party united in theory and practice. The only basis for this unification is the program of revolutionary social democrats with all the practical consequences that entails, or, in other words, an "orthodox program."

In the proposed brochure we are going to analyze the draft of such an "orthodox program" presented by the editors of Iskra and Zarya. Along the way, we will also express our opinion on those disagreements which we have not been able to discuss in sufficient detail up to now. Now, everything "specific" that Iskra introduced into the old program of the Russian revolutionary social democrats, on whose grounds we stood when, following Comrade Plekhanov and Axelrod, together with our comrades from Iskra, we came out with a direct polemic against Rabocheye Dyelo, has crystallized in the draft of its program and has come to fruition.

We will not comment in detail on the articles by Comrades Plekhanov and Lenin, published in the fourth volume of the long-defunct journal "Zarya." And we hope to prove that it is precisely this "specific," "something new," that makes the program of "Iskra" not truly orthodox, but only "more or less," "in places" orthodox.

We regret that this program, promised for the third issue of Iskra, is so "belated." As in the polemic with Rabocheye Dyelo, we preferred to deal with the program rather than with individual articles. We hope that our comrades will understand why we, too, had to be "belated" with our criticism. It is also understandable that we had to delve into some "dry" theoretical details. After all, we are dealing with a project whose proponents, in the words

of Comrade Plekhanov, "are not afraid of being known as orthodox." And we had to justify in detail our disagreement with those "places" of the program that only seemed orthodox.

9. "IN SPITE" TO THE AUTHOR OF THE "SHITTY LITTLE BOOK [Bernstein]". - PG 45

We see that the specter of the eternally self-conscious author of a "trash book" frightens our orthodox believers to such an extent that the program is beginning to assume only a "more or less" orthodox character. They seem to sense this themselves, and in order to deflect accusations of Bernsteinism from the other side, they resort to a special device that truly represents "something new" and has not yet occurred to the "Germans." "In defiance" of the author of the "trash book," who said that for him "the movement is to emphasize at every opportunity its special passion for the 'ultimate goal.'"4. "IN SPITE" TO THE AUTHOR OF THE "ROADY LITTLE BOOK".

We see that the specter of the eternally self-conscious author of a "trash book" frightens our orthodox believers to such an extent that the program is beginning to assume only a "more or less" orthodox character. They seem to sense this themselves, and in order to deflect accusations of Bernsteinism from the other side, they resort to a special device that truly represents "something new" and has not yet occurred to the "Germans." "In defiance" of the author of the "trash book," who said that for him "the movement is to emphasize at every opportunity its special passion for the 'ultimate goal.'"

"Russian social democracy pursues the same ultimate goal." "This ultimate goal is determined." "The ultimate goal of all activities of international social democracy." "On the path to their common ultimate goal!"

Who would dare to say now that we are dealing not with a truly orthodox, but with a "more or less" orthodox program?! After all, it was said: "Behold, a lion, and not a dog!"

There's a Russian proverb that says, "You can't spoil porridge with butter." But, like many Russian proverbs, it's wrong. The authors of the project "overbuttered" it, and, in their Suzdal zeal, emphasized precisely that part of the program that we share with opportunists of all countries.

In the article I have already mentioned, Comrade Plekhanov also noted the curious fact that even Mr. Bernstein's much-discussed phrase, "movement is everything, and the final goal is

nothing," was borrowed by Bernstein from Schulze-Gevernitz. We, for our part, think that the author of the "trash little book" was capable of coming up with this phrase himself. But whether this phrase was borrowed or not, it is the spiritual property of Mr. Bernstein alone. With the exception of Peus, the Bernsteinites turned out to be much more "diplomatic" than their teacher. And since we fully agree with the opinion of Comrade Plekhanov, that Bernstein, taken by himself, is not only not scary, but simply ridiculous, and that only the Bernsteiniada is very scary, then we will turn to the Bernsteinians.

Let us listen to Turati, the leader of the Italian opportunists: "In the tendency, there is a difference between the reformists and the 'revolutionaries', since both strive for collectivism (public ownership of land and other instruments of production)." "Lord, Lord!"

And what did the head of the Austrian opportunists, Pernerstorfer, say at the Vienna Party Congress? Should I quote from the speeches of Vollmar, Jaurès, and even the "cavalier of the Russian" what is socialism. In the words of the Austrian program:

"The proletarian must come to the realization that he must contribute to this development and accelerate it, and that the transfer of the tools of labor into the common property of the entire people must be the goal, and the conquest of political power must be the means of struggle for the liberation of the working class."

Therefore, the "ultimate goal" of social democracy, i.e. the proletariat, which has understood the historical conditions and the very nature of the economic revolution taking place before our eyes and has clarified the significance of its class struggle, is the social revolution, the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, which is inevitable and necessary during the transitional period, during which it will be necessary to accelerate the "natural" development of capitalism towards its "ultimate goal" - communism. This "ultimate goal" of social democracy, with its iron logic, dictates the form of the "movement" leading to it and clearly and precisely defines all its tactics. Social democracy quite consciously wants to be and remain the class movement of the proletariat; it energetically opposes any attempt to obscure the class struggle unfolding before our eyes, and, seeing in the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie brought to its natural end the only path to the emancipation of the working class, it must energetically combat any attempt to replace this struggle with any form of "collaboration" between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. As Kautsky says, "the goals and movements in social democracy are closely linked; one cannot be separated from the other." That is why any combination of the words "ultimate goal" and

"movement" in the Bernsteinian and anti-Bernsteinian spirit is completely meaningless. They divide the inseparable; they tear social democracy into two independent parts: socialism and class and the struggle of the proletariat, since social democracy is an inseparable connection of the labor movement with socialism.

The "ultimate goal" is at the same time the "starting point" of social democracy. Precisely because the contradictions of the existing system can now find their final resolution only in socialism, it makes it the starting point of its "direct revolutionary struggle," the center of gravity of all its propaganda and agitation. Being a socialist does not at all mean: from here to there, from town to town, painting pictures of a beautiful future, das Endziel betonen, as the Germans say. Incomparably more important is criticism of the existing, the present, showing that there is no other way out except socialism. But criticism is truly merciless, criticism that does not stop at every step for fear of becoming "sectarian," criticism that does not helplessly become entangled in all the more or less abundantly presented to us by reality, criticism that prefers to "run ahead" rather than "lag behind," criticism of everything that exists from the point of view of the class interests of the proletariat alone. Only in this case can we call ourselves orthodox, faithfully reflecting orthodox reality.

And the orthodox character of the program is best emphasized by the merciless criticism of capitalism and the precise indication of the "ultimate goal" of social democracy—the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat—than by the repetition of the word "ultimate goal." "Not everyone who says: 'Lord, Lord!' will enter the kingdom of heaven." Recognition of the "ultimate goal" does not yet make us social democrats.

That is why we think that Russian social democrats should not resort to such a Suzdal method if they want their program not only to appear, but also to be, orthodox. "Without further ado," they can follow the example of Western European orthodoxies and abandon such an unnecessary intrusion into their program, as a repetition of the words "the final goal." They have other, more effective means to show that "behold a lion, not a dog!"

PART THREE.

Opportunism in the uniform of the Orthodox Church.

1) Comrade Lenin at a rendezvous with the Marshal of the Nobility.

When, after a long wait, I finally received the draft of the Iskra program, I was not just disappointed, but surprised. The "dictatorship of the proletariat" and at the same time a "minimal program" with an agrarian section whose positive nature would have delighted even the strictest political "realist"; the strange formulation, according to which the program for the workers already demands such and such reforms, while for the peasants it will only strive to achieve them; the conviction that even within the framework of an autocratic system it is possible to implement the political and social reforms listed in the program, an implementation, of course, not complete, not consistent, not lasting—all this was so unexpected that I was at a loss. I knew, of course, that "eagles sometimes fly lower than hens." But even knowing this, I still could not agree that the eagle (more or less) would fly the first part with the chicken.

floundering that the second part "reveals" itself. And I searched in vain for a solution to this problem. Like Tya-pushkin, I love to always look for a "guiding thread," a thought that would connect both parts of this project. In particularly difficult cases, Tya-pushkin used "folk-

in a special way and turned to some "little man" who knew how to somehow explain the most intricate task of life in a particularly concrete way and always from a completely unexpected point of view.

"You thought to explain the phenomenon by the predominance of some system, direction, you assumed that at the root of the matter there was some plan, that it was necessary to explain the matter by the theory of "protectionism" or the theory of "free trade", etc., but in fact it turns out that the root of the whole matter is "Avdotya Mikolavna from the actresses."

I have such a "person" too. He is Adonis Ostromordov, a remarkably nimble "social democratic reporter, able to worm his way into any backstage." His special function makes him especially capable of assessing the "role of the individual in history." The "backstage" explains everything to him. A new theory, a new party, a new group—all this turns out to be the result of the conscious play of some "individual" or "individuals." He denies the "element of nature" a limine and often laughed at me when, in explaining some phenomenon, I tried to get to the bottom of the "factor." And so now, having good-naturedly chided me for my "doctrinaireism," he immediately illuminated the problem that occupied me from a completely unexpected angle. While wandering around various resorts on the

duties of his office, he accidentally witnessed that meeting with the Marshal of the Nobility, which "Zarya" had reported on in its second issue. Here is his story.

The meeting took place in Carlsbad on April 1, 1902, a little excited, nervously after dinner. Comrade Lenin paced back and forth. The hour had finally arrived for the meeting, which was supposed to "show with their own eyes all the secret economists" that Russian social democracy could lead the active work of various opposition strata. And he was excited in anticipation

moment. True to his aristocratic habits, His Excellency deigned to be somewhat late.

But lo and behold, after an agonizing 10-15 minutes, the leader finally appears. He is in a very cheerful mood, his face shows an awareness of his "conditional dignity," and his eyes sparkle with intelligence. He extends his right hand (all five fingers!), Comrade Lenin gives him his and, true to his rule of keeping his hand on the liberals' shoulder, places his left on his shoulder. His Excellency is a little surprised, but as an "intelligent" man, he quickly realizes that this is probably the custom among "them" and resigns himself to his somewhat awkward position. Just in case, he gracefully slips his hand into his pocket and feels for his revolver. He had heard from another leader that "in essence" these people were simply anarchists, unafraid even of the gallows. And although Peter Struve had told him that he would be dealing with a completely cultured man, in the "depths" of his soul he trusted his brother more "than the former Marxist."

"Excuse me, I seem to be a little late. I was detained by one of our romantics. How aptly you characterized them! They simply cannot understand the demands of power in their time and always dream of a serf-like system. Economic progress is like Greek to them. But before getting down to business, allow us to sincerely thank you for the energy with which you distributed Witte's note "Autocracy and the Zemstvo". It opened our eyes to the true state of affairs. And the magnificent preface by Pyotr Bernhardovich? Yes, yes! I tell you with complete conviction: the spirit of Peter the Great rested upon him. A remarkably deep mind, enormous erudition, and at the same time with liberals - many intelligent and educated people". Notes for those social democrats who did not have the happiness to meet with liberals and who know this fact "Among us, The first edition of Witte's note with a preface by P. II. C. unknown, (P. Struve) published by the firm "Zari".

I've become this wonderful magazine. The first book didn't satisfy me, but the second made a wonderful impression on both my comrades and me. And, as you've quite rightly noted, the proof is obvious. Now let's get down to business. We're not talkers, after all, but sober politicians. - And so, in your opinion, the return of the cuts is the best way to end the labor system and eliminate all remnants of serfdom…

Tov. Lenin, quickly realizing that our liberal had moved to one peak, eagerly "pushed" him "on the arshin" and, not wanting to hide his intentions, noticed him. "And in the interests of the free development of class struggle in the village. This is precisely the specific difference of the social democratic agrarian pro-tram.

Somewhat taken aback by this unexpectedness, the leader reached for his revolver, but seeing that Comrade Lenin, having given him a "yardstick" of encouragement, had calmed down, he himself immediately regained his composure. Being an intelligent man, he quickly realized: "This fanatic, it seems, values the label very highly. I'm not a child, after all, to get worked up over labels."

"Of course, of course. You call it social democracy. So be it. I have nothing against it."

He said this bien haut and immediately added: "Well, and to be honest, this social democrat" (of course, to himself, for he was an experienced diplomat).

A short pause. The marshal wants to ask a question, but is obviously embarrassed. The fact is that, greatly disturbed by the peasant unrest, he was afraid that the peasants, who had difficulty distinguishing romantic landowners from practical landowners, might decide to take advantage of all the land. He had already reconciled himself to the idea that they would have to cede the sections taken away in 1861 (His father, although a great admirer of the theater, already, at the first rumors of

(liberation, managed to cut a significant jackpot from the peasants). Having learned from Pyotr Bernhardovich that Iskra was the organ of the most influential revolutionary party, he wanted to make sure that these "anarchists" would really be satisfied with just scraps. But the question was a delicate one. And he glanced furtively at Comrade Lenin.

And "the man with the plan was dreaming at that time. Comrade Lenin, who put forward a broad and bold plan, inspiring respect even in his opponents, is a profound politician, but

he loves to dream, although, ashamed of such an activity, he hides behind Pisarev. What was he dreaming about? Was it that liberals, personally incapable of military service, "encouraged" and "pushed" by Iskra, would take on the bulk of civilian work of supplying the army with weapons, provisions, apartments, and information, not to mention the "red cross"? Did he already imagine endless rows of government buildings with weapons and provisions, millions, millions, millions? It's hard to say. But he dreamed.

"A dreamer," our leader thought to himself with a slight smile and quietly moved his shoulder, on which Comrade Lenin's hand rested. The latter immediately came to his senses, for even in his sleep he remembered that the party of the proletariat must catch every liberal when he is about to make an inch. But our liberal sat calmly. "Of course, the elimination of the most barbaric forms of exploitation-

The peasantry's problems are an urgent task at the present time, and I completely agree with your formulation of the question. But perhaps this is only your personal opinion. After all, Mr. G. Plekhanov, a terrible-passez-moi le mot-brouil-lon and as tactless a man as Chernyshevsky, takes a close part in the editorial boards of your party organs. During the famine of 1891-92, he proposed the complete expropriation of large landowners and spoke very contemptuously of the bourgeois representatives who hope to settle everything with minor cuts. We are very glad

accept the hand you extend, but you yourself understand that such a prospect can only spoil the good relations between today's and even tomorrow's allies."

"You're right, but I can reassure you. At first, this was indeed my personal opinion, but now the entire editorial board shares it, and consequently, Mr. Plekhanov as well. It's your turn. Say something sharp and firm, appropriate to the occasion. It will come in handy, and we'll be on our way. Down with the autocratic bureaucracy! *) That's our common slogan!"

What happened next, Ostromordov couldn't tell me. He was suddenly noticed, and had to leave somewhat hastily. But what he heard was enough for him to explain Iskra's agrarian program as a desire to dictate a program of action even to such an oppositional stratum as the liberal nobility. Unfortunately, I couldn't be satisfied with this explanation. While it shed some light on the agrarian part of the program, other parts of the minimal program did not "subordinate" themselves to such a fundamental "idea."

Only Comrade Lenin's commentary on the minimum program, which appeared two months later, showed me that I had wasted my time and effort. The more I read and reread this article, the more convinced I became that finding "unity" in a program whose authors had deliberately composed it from parts completely different in their basic idea would be as easy as embracing the ungraspable. I give the floor to Comrade Lenin.

"In favor of hired workers, we demand from modern society such reforms that will protect them from physical and moral degeneration and increase their ability to fight; in favor of the peasants, we seek such demands that will promote

*) "Iskra", No. 4: "Autocracy and Zemstvo".accept the hand you extend, but you yourself understand that such a prospect can only spoil the good relations between today's and even tomorrow's allies."

"You're right, but I can reassure you. At first, this was indeed my personal opinion, but now the entire editorial board shares it, and consequently, Mr. Plekhanov as well. It's your turn. Say something sharp and firm, appropriate to the occasion. It will come in handy, and we'll be on our way. Down with the autocratic bureaucracy! ("Iskra", No. 4: "Autocracy and Zemstvo".

) That's our common slogan!"

What happened next, Ostromordov couldn't tell me. He was suddenly noticed, and had to leave somewhat hastily. But what he heard was enough for him to explain Iskra's agrarian program as a desire to dictate a program of action even to such an oppositional stratum as the liberal nobility. Unfortunately, I couldn't be satisfied with this explanation. While it shed some light on the agrarian part of the program, other parts of the minimal program did not "subordinate" themselves to such a fundamental "idea."

Only Comrade Lenin's commentary on the minimum program, which appeared two months later, showed me that I had wasted my time and effort. The more I read and reread this article, the more convinced I became that finding "unity" in a program whose authors had deliberately composed it from parts completely different in their basic idea would be as easy as embracing the ungraspable. I give the floor to Comrade Lenin.

"In favor of hired workers, we demand from modern society such reforms that will protect them from physical and moral degeneration and increase their ability to fight; in favor of the peasants, we seek such demands that will promote

"the elimination of the remnants of the old serfdom and the free development of class struggle in the countryside." We demand reforms for the benefit of the workers, but we seek demands for the benefit of the peasants?! Wise Edin, allow it!

Further: "In the workers' department, we have no right to go beyond the demands of social reform; in the peasants' department, we must not stop short of social-revolutionary demands. Or, to put it another way: in the workers' department, we are absolutely limited by the framework of the minimum program; in the peasants' department, we can and must offer a maximum program."

We see that the minimum program stands on two legs: one is reformist, the other is revolutionary.

To leave no doubt in the reader's mind on this matter, Comrade Lenin continues: "In both sections we set forth not our ultimate goal, but our immediate demands. In both, therefore, we must remain on the basis of modern (bourgeois) society. This is the similarity between both sections. But their fundamental difference lies in the fact that the workers' section contains demands directed against the bourgeoisie, while the peasants' section contains demands directed against the serf-owning landowners… In the workers' section of immediate demands we cannot put forward social-revolutionary demands, for the social revolution, which overthrows the rule of the bourgeoisie, is already the revolution of the proletariat, realizing our ultimate goal. In the peasant section we also put forward social-revolutionary demands, for a social revolution that overthrows the rule of the serf-owning landowners is possible even on the basis of the given order… In the workers' section we are on the basis of social reform, for we demand what the bourgeoisie can give us without losing its rule. In the peasant section we must, unlike the social reformers, also demand that we, the peasants, will never be allowed to remain here only in

and the landowners cannot give the landowners the right to demand that they be able to take over the revolutionary movement of the peasantry only by force."

"It is clear, therefore, that the criterion of immediate and proximate 'feasibility' is applicable in general only to the obviously reformist sections and points of our program, and not at all to the program of a revolutionary party in general. In other words, this criterion is applicable to our program only as an exception, and not as a general rule."

Thus, the implementation of the demands of the agrarian section of the program presupposes a revolution, while the demands of the workers' section are possible through reforms. Now it is clear why the program demands in the workers' section, while in the peasant section it will only strive. Only then can the strange statement made at the end of the program be understood: "For its part, the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party is firmly convinced that the complete, consistent, and lasting implementation of the aforementioned political and social transformations can be achieved only through the overthrow of the tsarist autocracy and the convocation of a constituent assembly freely elected by the entire people."

Neither the complete, consistent, nor durable implementation of such a political transformation as universal suffrage or such a social transformation as an 8-hour workday!

Wouldn't it be more accurate to say that even through revolutions we will not achieve the complete, consistent, and lasting implementation of the aforementioned political and social transformations? That would be closer to the truth.

The authors of the program fell victim to a "template." In Western Europe, social democratic parties have an "ultimate goal" and "immediate demands." With the latter, it is is drawn to the bourgeois state. But what makes sense in Western Europe is nonsense here*).

We will now see how a minimum program could be formed, which would set itself the goal of replacing absolutism with a democratic republic, in which the working part is the sum of demands made on the modern state and the agrarian part of which will seek demands that presuppose a revolutionary movement of the peasantry.

- pg 176

Broken Illusion 1904

Table of contents

I. The Tower of Babel - 1

II. Union or union? - 8

III. The Unconscious Marxists - 19

IV. From dust, from heat - a nickel for a pair - 37

V. Agitators as organizers - 54

VI. Against organizational fetishism - 75

VII. "From above" or "from below"? - 88

Conclusion - 103

Marx and the Russians in the 40s

Ogdel Seal of the Moscow Union of Workers and Red Army Deputies,

MOSCOW. - 1919.

I

Along with the entire German democracy of the 1940s, Karl Marx was always an implacable enemy of official Russia. But for a very long time, until the end of the 1960s, he also regarded oppositional Russia, if not with hostility, then with great skepticism and distrust. This profound antipathy was based not only on a theoretical prejudice against

"Slavs," which Marx, like Engels, largely inherited from German radicals, although neither of them ever denied the Russian Slavs either the right or the capacity to be called a "pstoriated" people. On the contrary, both founders of scientific socialism, despite their evolving views on this point, nevertheless recognized that the Russian Slavs were called to play a greater historical role than other Slavs, but they relegated this to a later future. Meanwhile, the fact of the invincible dominance of the "state" over "society," which, in their opinion, did not provoke any protests from the masses, crossed Russia off the list of those countries in which communists, while refusing to implement their "ultimate goals," could nevertheless take part in an opposition movement directed against the existing political order. Representatives of such an opposition in Russia were, from this point of view, a "product of parasitic creativity," a transfer of the tasks put forward by Western European development to an environment completely alien to them. And the personal experience of Marx and Engels, it seemed to them, only confirmed this theoretical prejudice.

We have Marx's own testimony, which shows that his distrust of Russian revolutionaries was also the result of his personal acquaintance with them and repeated disappointments. Thus, in one of his letters to his friend Kugelmann, Marx, informing him that a Russian translation of Capital was being prepared, recalls his previous meetings with Russians in Paris:

"By some twist of fate, it is precisely the Russians, whom I have been tirelessly attacking for 25 years not only in the German, but also in the French and English press, who have always been my 'well-wishers.' In 1843-44, in Paris, the Russian aristocrats took me in their arms. My essay against Proudhon (Misère de la philosophie. Paris-Brussels, 1847), as well as the book published by Duncker (Zur Kritik der politischen Oekonomie. Berlin, 1859.), found nowhere such a wide market as in Russia. And the first foreign nation to translate Capital is again Russian. But this, of course, cannot be given much importance. The Russian aristocracy in their youth studies at German universities and in Paris. They greedily pounce on the very last thing that the West can give them. For them, this is simply a delicacy. We encounter the same phenomenon among a section of the French aristocracy in the 18th century. As Voltaire used to say about his educational activities: "This is not for tailors and not for shoemakers." All this does not prevent those same Russians, as soon as they enter government service, from turning into scoundrels. ("Letter of October 12, 1868," Neue Zeit", XX (1902), Band 2, p. 224.)

Marx's sentence was not particularly lenient. But was it fair? Wasn't this simply a reflection of the "German's" hatred of the "Slavs," which dictated to Marx the same vicious lines about Russians that the "Slav" Herzen later wrote about "Germans in exile"?

This curious question could only be clarified if we were able to establish with what kind of "Russian aristocrats" Marx was dealing at that time. And at the same time

At the same time, the solution of this particular question would help us to clarify another question, namely: was there any direct ideological influence of Marx's views on the people of the forties, and in what form could it have manifested itself or did it actually manifest itself?

That Marx did not have Bakunin in mind specifically, who also belonged to the "Russian aristocrats" in Paris at the time, is evident from the fact that he does not mention him, although his name is self-evident. Marx would undoubtedly not have failed to do so in a letter to Kugelmann, with whom he readily shared facts and impressions from his activities in the International, if his harsh judgment had applied specifically to Bakunin, or only partially to him. Neither in the 1940s nor afterward did our "apostle of destruction," with all his respect for Marx's scholarship and genius, belong to the ranks of enthusiastic admirers of whom Marx writes. There were undoubtedly other "Russian aristocrats" who, in their search for the "last word" of European enlightenment, turned to Arnold Ruge, co-editor of the "Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher," who was then well-known among Russian left-wing Hegelians and Feuerbachists. We must therefore seek them among the Russian émigrés and travelers of the forties.

It should be noted, however, that Marx excessively narrows the chronological cycle of his acquaintances with "Russian aristocrats." They do not at all relate only to 1843-1844, as one might conclude based on the literal text of his letter to Kugelmann. On the contrary, these meetings, having begun in 1843-44, continued, and acquaintances, even after Marx's expulsion from Paris and his move to Brussels. They were maintained through the mediation of Engels, who lived in Paris for long periods, and were also re-established by Russians passing through Brussels.

If for the romantics of the twenties the main point of attraction abroad was Göttingen, if for the "idealists of the thirties" it was Berlin, then already at the beginning of the 40s, together with the protest against orthodox Hegelianism and the weakening of "Gallophobia", the

most active Members of the Russian intelligentsia begin to flock to Paris, to the "country of Saint-Simon, Cobé, Fourier, Loup Blanc, and especially Georges Sand." A stay in Berlin becomes less attractive also because the brief "spring of the early forties" in Prussia very soon gave way to a new paroxysm of reaction. It is no coincidence that the flock to Paris at this time also embraced the German intelligentsia with particular force.

For Russians, Paris, which for a long time after the Pûlée Revolution had been a forbidden fruit, permitted to be enjoyed only by a fortunate few who had received special permission from the authorities, was of particular interest. On the Continent, it was then the only place where one could witness a heated parliamentary struggle on a more or less large scale; where one could become acquainted with the rich literature on social issues without any particular external interference; where one could become acquainted not only through books, but also at meetings and in direct personal contact with the luminaries of French socialism of the time. Of course, a certain role was also played by the fact that nowhere else could one so conveniently combine the "useful" with the "pleasant," and the reputation of a "modern Babylon" that had been established for Paris only increased the attraction of our "superfluous people" to it.

Unfortunately, it is now only with great difficulty that we can determine the personnel of the Russian colony in Paris at that time. What clues can Annenkov, who left behind in his memoirs a frequently cited description of Marx, give us? We will see, however, that these memoirs, despite their apparently photographic accuracy, contain many errors and not a few untruths. In any case, the data provided by Annenkov can serve as a starting point for us in investigating the question of which "Russian aristocrats" Marx might have met in Paris. (The special chapter dedicated by Professor Emile Haumont (La culture française en Russie, Paris, 1900, pp. 392-402) to the "Russian visitors to Tsaraj at Loup-Filitz" does not give a single new indication. Unlike M. Pettlau, who in his monumental biography of Bakunin did not limit himself to only Russian data, but also tried to use French and German literature, and Haumont did not even make an attempt to develop modern French literature, he left the question of Russian emigration in Paris completely aside.).

II

"When I arrived in Paris in the spring of 1846, I already found there a whole Russian colony with its main and outstanding members, B. and S-v, occupied with the continuous search

and discussion of everyday, historical, philosophical and all sorts of questions that the public life of Paris under the liberal king Louis Philippe constantly aroused" (P. V. Annenkov. "Literary Memories and Critical Articles." Part Three. St. Petersburg, 1881, p. 154). B., this is Bakunin, S.-v. Sazonov. Bakunin moved to Paris from Switzerland in July 1844, Sazonov settled there even earlier.

In addition to Linepkov's testimony, we also have the testimony of A. Ya. Golovacheva-Panaeva, who lived with her husband, II. I. Papaev, in Paris in the autumn of 1844. It gives us an opportunity to look into the life of the Russian colony in Paris at the time when Marx was still living there.

"The cheap restaurant where we went for lunch became a gathering point for Russian travelers. Sazonov, who had been living in Paris for four years, often deigned to show up. He would pose as an aristocrat, grumble about the impossibility of dining in such a tavern, get angry at the waiter for serving him poorly, and always order expensive dishes for himself. Heated debates about French politics took place between Sazonov and Bakunin." (Recollected by A. Ya. Golovacheva. "Historical Bulletin". 1889, March, p. 555)

Golovacheva also mentions V. P. Botkin, who at that time was still very close to Bakunin. During the latter's disputes with Sazonov, he, according to her, was a martyr. He imagined spies everywhere, and in every visitor dining alone at the table, he was ready to see a spy and became terribly angry with those arguing. "His imagin-

The situation sometimes got so bad that he ran away from the restaurant in fear." That Botkin really lived in Paris at the time and moved around not only among Russians but also Germans is also evident from Arnold Ruge's letter to Fleischer (November 23, 1844), where, speaking of one German, he writes that the latter "is not worse than Botkin and better than most of Bakupin's other friends and drinking companions" 1).

The testimony of Golovacheva, and to a certain extent that of her husband, Papaev, is not always reliable. There is an overly strong element of gossip in them; but while they cannot be trusted where the content of ideological disagreements is concerned, she readily grasps and remembers Golovachev's traits. Besides those mentioned, Golovachev and Panaev also mention Nikolai Gavrilovich Frolov, the renowned translator of "Kosmos." But he, like Kudryavtsev, lived a reclusive life in Paris and was too little interested in anything that lay beyond the scope of his specialized scholarly interests, as is evident from his letters to

Ogarev, published along with those of other friends of Herzen and Ogarev in "Russkaya Mysl."

With the help of this correspondence we can establish that N. M. Satin lived in Paris in the spring of 1844 (in a letter of March 3, 1844, he mentions Botkin, Sazonov, and Frolov) and then came there again from Berlin in March 1845; that Ogarev, whom Golovacheva supposedly saw in Paris in the autumn of 1844, in fact arrived there only in the autumn of 1845 and had already returned to Berlin in January 1846 3). If we add Melgunov and a certain landowner Klykov, with stories of whose adventures in Paris Panaev made his Moscow friends laugh, then they, apparently, complete the circle of people with whom Marx could have met in Paris before his expulsion in January 1845.

Which of these "Russian aristocrats" did Marx know? Let's remember that he arrived in Paris in November.

1) Arnold Ruge's. Briefwechsel and Tagebûchblätter aus den Jahren 1825-1880". Band. 1, p. 375. 2) Papaev. I. I. "Literary Memories". Collection of Sochi-pecies. Volume six. St. Petersburg, 1883, pp. 228-31, 233-34.

2) "From the correspondence of pedagogical figures". "Russian Thought". 1891, July August.

--

PG 8

Tags:

Characters:

References:

2025-12-20

13:31